THE

Fig-leaf Covering Discovered:

OR,

Geo. Keith's

Explications and Retractations

OF

Divers Passages out of his former Books,

Proved Insincere, Defective and Evasive.

By JOHN PENINGTON.

Thou art weighed in the Ballances, and found wanting, Dan. 5. 27.

Out of thine own Mouth, will I judge thee, Luke 19.22.

Qui alterum incusat probri, ipsum se intueri oportet.

LONDON,

Printed and Sold by *T. Sowle*, near the *Meeting-house* in *White-Hart-Court* in *Grace-Church-street*; and at the *Bible* in *Leaden-hall-street* near the *Market*, 1697.

A1

The Fig-leaf Covering diſcovered, &c.

THE ſhare I have had in this Controverſy, depending between *G. K.* and his *quondam* Brethren, the People called Quakers, hath not been ſo much Argumentative (that I found ready done to my hands) as to turn his own Weapon upon himſelf, and detect the Inconſtancy and Contradiction of the Man, who while pretending to give *a Liſt of* others *groſs and vile Errors* (as in his *True Copy*, p. 17.) and reflecting on ſeveral of our Friends by name (without excepting any) as *holding groſs and vile Errors, oppoſite to ſome of the fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, and yet ſo Hypocritical, as not to own and retract in publick their Errors expoſed in publick, even leſt ſuch Retraction and Correction ſhould leſſen their Honour and Eſteem among their too credulous Followers and Admirers* (ſee *Preface* to *Groſs Errors*, p. 2.) yet had not then eſſayed to correct his own, which by his own confeſſion (*True Copy*, p. 17.) *Needed both further Explanation, and in ſome part* (as he mincingly worded it) *an Emendation and Correction.* This gave me occaſion, after having inſpected his Books, wherein I found many Contradictions both doctrinal and perſonal, as well as Abſurdities, to be engaged in laying them before himſelf and others (the which I exhibited in three Tracts, the one entituled *Apoſtate Expoſed*, the other *People called Quakers Cleared*, and the third *Keith againſt Keith*, the firſt and laſt of which he is ſtill Debtor to) who have more than once called upon him for them (they having been promiſed in the third Month 1695) and at length told him, upon the great Joy and Peace he pretended to have in his publiſhing a lame Retraction of his former Expoſition of two Scriptures (which yet fell abundantly ſhort of what had been propoſed by him) *That perhaps, had I*

not forced him to it, by expoſing of him, he had ſtayed yet another Twelve-month, before he had given them, as in my *Keith againſt Keith*, p. 90, 91.

Now, after long Importunity (like the Widow to the unjuſt Judge) he emits ſomething which he entitules, *Explications and Retractations of divers Paſſages contained in his former Books*, which that it may not want for noiſe, and perhaps to ſtave off the work he is already clogged with, he gives out *may at preſent ſuffice for a Reply to* T. E's *and my late and former Books*, Five of which now ſtick upon his hands. Yet leſt he ſhould ſeem wholly to fore-cloſe himſelf from a *larger Anſwer*, he tells us, p. 42. *he hopes to do it*, E'RE VERY LONG.

This naturally leads me to call to mind, how he hath ſerved *T. E.* with reſpect to two of his, which he told us, in his *Poſtſcript* to his *Groſs Errors*, printed *Anno* 1695, it was PROBABLE a due anſwer might be given to in due time, which due time is not yet come with him, but he hath laboured to ſhift it by more Artifices than one. For ſeeing what juſt ground I may have (at leaſt) to ſuſpect him the Compoſer of thoſe ſeven Queries propoſed by the Biſhop of *London*'s Chaplain to our *Yearly Meeting* Anno 1695, and made publick by himſelf, which he improved to cut himſelf out new work, while the old lay on his hands (as if it had been therefore deſigned) 'tis manifeſt from his Summoning us to meet him at *Turner-Hall*, alledging *want of Time and ability of Eſtate to print anſwers to us*, and his ſince telling us (in his Book *Antichriſts and Sadducees*, p. 21.) that he hath *offered to anſwer Vivâ voce, that there is no end of anſwering in print, few will be at the pains to compare book with book, and the Charge is too great for him*, that he would fain have ſhifted that free and open way of anſwering by the Preſs, which he had drawn us into, and where we had purſued him, by appointing, without our conſent, a day to Arraign us at his Bar, wherein

wherein had we complied, he might (as I once told him) have run off from the Cauſe he was hampered with and uneaſie under, and by wrangling a-freſh upon ſome out-skirts of the Controverſie, have drop'd the main one. Now this Project failing, What doth he do? Betake himſelf to anſwer *T. E.* in Print? Nothing leſs: But then he tries, whether he can ſet the Church of *England* and the Proteſtant Diſſenters upon our Backs, informeth them, *Vile Errors are boldly and avowedly promoted among a ſort or Gang of Quakers, as are not only as bad as any Popery, but MUCH WORSE than the WORST of Popery*, in divers reſpects, animates them to *ſuppreſs our Books and diſturb our Meetings, elſe Papiſts will out-do them in Zeal*, &c. *Ant. & Sadd.* p. 40, 41. It is after all this, when none of theſe ways would take, that the poor Man is fain to pretend he hath anſwered them all at once, in the Book before me.

To which he prefixeth a *Preface*, wherein he excuſeth his *delay, as having found divers more Paſſages that needed an Explanation, and ſome of them a Correction, above what he had diſcovered, when he publiſhed his purpoſe.* So that it is to be hoped, it is now effectually done, in his own Judgment. But it ſeems our *great Brags, telling of great matter of Contradictions and other Abſurdities, found in his Books, juſtly occaſioned a longer delay.* Which I think ſhould rather have forwarded him. I will aſſure him, had he collected thoſe Paſſages out of his Books, ready to my hands, which I was fain to tumble over his Books for, it had eaſed me, and facilitated my work. As to his telling his Reader, *We have an Itch to Scribble, repeating the ſame things over, again and again, that we manifeſtly pervert his words, palpably bewraying our Ignorance and Folly*, ſeeing he pretends, *if God permit, he may hereafter diſcover it in divers Particulars.* I ſhall only ſay thus much, that were he but one of thoſe, he once ſpoke of, that are more ready

falſly to Accuſe, than juſtly to Prove, he might have ſuſpended his Brag, till he had brought his Proof along with him.

Thus much to excuſe his Delay; now for beginning with us, before he had ſwept his own Houſe; he alledges four things: 1. *That his free Acknowledgment might excuſe him from beginning with his own Books, till he had brought us to an equal Acknowledgment, or upon our ſtubborn and pertinacious Conceit of our Books, he might the more juſtly expoſe us, as guilty not only of Errors, but of holding them pertinaciouſly.* All which, with reſpect to us, is meerly precarious, a begging of the queſtion, who himſelf had once acquitted us, and that even from the Errors he would now faſten upon us, yea and out of ſome of the ſame Books he then cited in our Vindication, and we ſtill continue to defend as unjuſtly imputed to us, whereas his own (let him call them Errors, or ſome more diminutive name, if he pleaſe) he hath aſſigned as needing both Explication, Emendation and Correction. His ſecond, Aſſigning his own to be *Motes*, ours *Beams*, is too idle for me to take notice of, as thinking his Teſtimony on his own behalf not valid. His Thirdly, alledging our *Excommunicating* him, is as ſhallow: For had not that drawn him to be Vindictive, it would rather have ſtirred him up, by a free and open Retraction, to have approved himſelf, to have exceeded us in Confeſſing and Forſaking. And his laſtly is all of a piece with his ſecond, That *what he hath retracted or renounced, was never judged by him an Article of Faith*, and that *we have not proved him contradicting in his latter Books, any Article of Faith aſſerted in his former Books.* To which I reply, Had he not done his work by halves, he would have found cauſe to have retracted his doctrinal Errors, Errors which every body elſe, that knows what Errors are, will acknowledge to relate to Articles of Faith, and which as ſuch

we have exhibited and argued upon, which muſt be left to the indifferent Reader's Judgment, who hath read his and our Books. In the mean time I enter upon examining thoſe before me, which he hath here pretended to explain or correct, which I alſo ſubmit to the Judicious, whether they relate not to Articles of Faith, and alſo whether *G. K.* hath at length done his Work Well, Sincerely and Conſcientiouſly, or on the contrary.

Sect. I.

§. 1. Beginning then with his firſt Section, *Containing*, as he ſaith, *divers Explanations and Emendations of Paſſages out of his Book of* Immediate Revelation not ceaſed, *Printed Anno* 1668, *and reprinted with an Appendix Anno* 1676, in his §. 1. he ſaith, *Some* (but who, he ſaith not) *are offended at the Term* Immediate Revelation, *and miſ-conſtrue it to a wrong Sence, never intended by him, as if he thereby did ſignifie ſuch a Revelation, as did give us the Doctrinal Knowledge and Faith of Chriſtian Religion, and Principles thereof, without the Holy Scriptures, or other outward means of Inſtruction.* To which I anſwer, The People called Quakers are not concerned in this Charge, at leaſt with reſpect to the Term *Immediate Revelation*, for they allow the thing, and diſpute not againſt the Term. And what himſelf hath ſaid, on behalf of the Neceſſity and Uſefulneſs of Immediate Revelation, the Book it ſelf will plainly evidence. Yet leſt this Reference may ſeem too general (a way I diſlike in my Antagoniſt) let the Reader conſult the *Preface*, and he will find *G. K.* there repreſents this Doctrine of Immediate Revelation, a great and weighty Matter, which it hath been in his Heart, once and again from the Lord, to write of [ſaying, that] 'It REMAINETH and is of neceſſary con-

' tinuance in the true Church----Not only for the Pre-
' ſervation, Safety and comfortable Walking of the
' Saints with God, but alſo in order to Men and Wo-
' mens becoming Saints. [And that] there is no Im-
' mediate Revelation now-a-days, as the common Pri-
' viledge of the Saints. [he accounts] ſuch a *Fundamen-*
' *tal* Error in Men, that the greateſt part of their other
' Errors are built on it, as 1. That the Scriptures out-
' ward Teſtimony is moſt neceſſary, and that no true
' and ſaving Knowledge of God is to be attained, but
' by the Scriptures being read or heard. See *Preface*, p. 1, 2. Now hence I argue, If it be an Error (according to *G. K.*) to aſſert that the Scriptures outward Teſtimony is moſt neceſſary, and that no true and ſaving Knowledge of God is to be attained, but by the Scriptures being read or heard: Then it is *G. K.* his Senſe, and not a Mis-conſtruction thereof, that a Saving Knowledge of God may be attained, by Immediate Revelation, without the help of the Scriptures, and that the Scriptures outward Teſtimony, is not moſt neceſſary, in his Judgment. And this Saving Knowledge muſt be a Knowledge of the Chriſtian Religion, except he be prepared to retract his Retraction.

But *to obviate this Offence and Miſtake* (as he terms it) *he recommends the Reader to what he hath ſaid, from* p. 38. *to* p. 42. *of that Book* (but cites no paſſage out of it) *where I diſtinguiſh*, ſaith he, *of means intermitting and tranſmitting, and ſhew that it is the intermitting means, that hinders the Revelation to be Immediate, but not the tranſmitting.* *Anſw.* Here he Shuffles, the Debate here is not whether Revelation be Immediate or no, when tranſmitted through organized Inſtruments, either the Holy Scriptures or Men divinely inſpired, but whether he hath aſſerted, ſuch an Immediate Revelation is not ceaſed, as is received with either the one or the other.

That

That the Reader may inform himself of, even in p. 40, within the compass of *G. K.* his Reference, for he there saith, 'We find that he sometimes useth outward 'means, and sometimes he useth them not, but con-'veigheth unto us, from and through his own Seed 'and Birth in us, the living Manifestations and Commu-'nications of his Life, Will and Council, many, yea 'MOST TIMES without all Means, or Instruments 'from without, for most times we are left alone as to 'Instruments or Means without us. I would advise him therefore, in his next, either to retract this Pas-sage, which is within the Pages he hath so lately re-commended to us, or his referring us thereto to ob-viate the pretended Mistake and Offence; for this Pas-sage will hamper him else.

Now let us see whether he mends the matter by his other Book, called, *Divine Immediate Revelation*, for he tells us that in p. 44. thereof as an instance, *He did own the Holy Scriptures to be a necessary means to give us the true Knowledge and Faith of Christian Doctrines and Principles:* But that his own Citation saith not, but only that *all other Doctrine and Heads of the Christian Religion* (which he calls *special*, the other *general Religion*) *are made known to us by the Scripture means, the Holy Spirit inwardly inlightning and inspiring*, &c. Which doth not prove that they are a necessary means, a *sine quâ non*, that without which the Knowledge cannot be conveighed, but that they are profitable and useful means, when at-tended with Divine Illumination and Inspiration, and therefore not *ad rem*. What he would have *noted, that twelve Years ago he distinguished between Gentile and Chri-stian Religion* (saith he, between *special* and *general* Reli-gion, say I) *though some call this a new Doctrine in him so to distinguish*, I think hath little of weight in it, except he had told us who his Accusers were. For my part, I do not account it a *New Doctrine* in him, to distinguish between

between ſpecial and general Religion, yet I do eſteem it a *Contradiction* to ſay, as in p. 63. of that Book, ‘ *Cornelius* received the Spirit immediately, and yet ob- ‘ tained it further by means of *Peter's* Preaching. [And again to aſſert,] ‘ It is an Error to ſay, *Cornelius* had ‘ the Holy Ghoſt in his Gentile State, but the Holy ‘ Ghoſt was promiſed PARTICULARLY to Be- ‘ lievers in him, to ſuch ONLY who believe in Chriſt ‘ crucified and raiſed again, *&c.* *Truth Advanced*, p. 70. neither of which he hath yet retracted.

He goes on, *Seeing the word Immediate Revelation is no Scripture Term (though Revelation is) I can freely conſent that the word Immediate be not preſſed, or impoſed on any. Anſw.* This is idle all over. We are not entring into a Strife of words with him, but will he retract the *things?* will he ſay, *Revelation* is not *Immediate*, now a days? which in two former Books he hath aſſerted that it is, and entitled one of them, *Immediate Revelation not ceaſed*, the other, *Divine Immediate Revelation continued in the True Church*; and told us the ill Conſequences of deny- ing it, aſſigning it as *ſuch a Fundamental Error, that the greateſt part of their other Errors are built on it, and in- deed the whole Superſtructure of their Church and Miniſtry, as to its outward Conſtitution*, (ſee *Preface* to *Imm. Rev.* p. 1.) This were he ſincere, he would either retract or fairly maintain, but inſtead of that, he playeth upon words, and acts the Sophiſter, to his great Shame, were he not paſt it. For whereas, even in p. 42. of *Imm. Rev.* a Page he recommends us to even now, he could then ſay, ‘ Theſe who miniſter not immediately from the ‘ immediate Communications of Life, in their own ‘ Hearts can do us no good, for they cannot Miniſter ‘ and tranſmit the Communications of Life, who have ‘ it not in themſelves; ſuch are *Wells without Water*, and ‘ *Clouds without Rain*, ſaid he then. Now ſuch Miniſters, who he knows ſtill oppoſe *Immediate Revelation*, and deny

deny an immediate Call, are by him reputed *Pious*, which is far from being Wells without Water and Clouds without Rain (for to ſuch was *reſerved the Blackneſs of Darkneſs for ever*, Jude 12. 13.) and perhaps given with a deſign to lick their Fingers, as well as that he hath laboured to irritate them againſt us, for to ſuppreſs our Books and diſturb our Meetings, that he might be eaſed of that Task he is ſo uneaſie under, and hath hitherto ſo unſucceſsfully wearied himſelf with.

§. 2. To ſweeten them and make Friends to himſelf of what he might as well account the Mammon of Unrighteouſneſs, as Wells without Water and Clouds without Rain, he in §. 2. mincingly gives part of what he had ſaid in the *Preface* to *Imm. Rev.* viz. *His blaming them who ſay the Scriptures are a filled-up Canon*, &c. And p. 4. of the Book it ſelf, *Though no new Eſſentials are to be added, yet a new and fuller and clearer Teſtimony may be added concerning the ſame old Eſſentials.* This laſt paſſage he clips egregiouſly, for he there ſaid, 'Now 'though we ſay, That the Scriptures are a full and 'perfect Teſtimony of all the Eſſentials of the Chriſtian 'Religion, yet we believe (*contrary to theſe of the National way*) that they are not a Canon ſo filled up, as 'no more is to be added unto them, from the ſame 'immediate Inſpiration of the Spirit of God through 'his Servants, of the SAME AUTHORITY with 'them, for though no new Eſſentials are to be added, 'yet a new and fuller and clearer Teſtimony may be 'added, concerning the ſame old Eſſentials. Now, as it is not his preſent Intereſt to give his Belief contrary to thoſe of the National way, for he craves their help againſt us; ſo inſtead of being ſo ſincere as to retract it, he ſlips it over in ſilence. And that his Belief now, and his Belief then, may not ſeem to interfere, he puts a Trick upon his Reader, concealing thoſe words, where he

he had ſaid [the Scriptures are not a Canon ſo filled up as no more is to be added to] and from the concluſive words, drawn from the Premiſes, he bids us *note the words* [*may be added*] *as importing the Poſſibility of ſuch a thing*, as if he had delivered nothing poſitive, had not aſſerted, they were not a Canon ſo filled up, as no more is to be added to, but had been only propoſing an Addition, as a thing not impoſſible. A plain downright Retraction, even of an Error, had been more to his Credit, than this falſe and deceitful Subterfuge, whereby the Man ſhews he rather labours to put a falſe Gloſs upon his Cauſe, than ingeniouſly to Recant, what now he is unwilling to defend. To this he adds, *Whether God ſhall be pleaſed to add to the Books of the Holy Scripture, other Books of the ſame Authority, in any time to come before the end of the World, I judge it not ſafe for me to determine, either in the Affirmative or the Negative.* *Anſw.* If he had not (by with holding that part of the Citation I have given, and a peruſing the Sence of that which he hath given, which he could never have done (uneſpied) had he cited the whole, as he ought) caſt a Miſt before his Readers Eyes, it would have been obvious that *G. K.* formerly was ſo far from not judging it ſafe for him to determine the Matter Negatively or Affirmatively, that he hath given his own Sence in the Affirmative, that Books of the ſame Authority with the Scriptures may be added. Who, were he now otherwiſe minded, and of an honeſt Mind not to mis-guide and abuſe his Reader, would rather have retracted, and given this as the Fruit of his ſecond Thoughts, than to have offered this, as his then Sentiments, which were not ſo, and would have been evident not to have been ſo, had the Citation been fairly given. I am perſwaded, that as the Learned among the Church of *England* will readily ſee, ſo the Pious will abhor his palpable Deceit and Prevarication.

§. 3. In

§. 3. In his §. 3. He labours to excuſe *his blaming them, who deny that there is an Infallible way, whereby to diſcern the True Miniſters and Members of Chriſt's Church from the Falſe* (he had added in that *Preface* to *Imm. Rev.* [Whence proceeds that promiſcuous mixt Number of Teachers and People, whereof their Church is compoſed, who are GENERALLY void of any Experience of a gracious Work, in their Hearts] but this he ſlily drops, as not ingenious enough to retract it, nor daring to defend it) by telling us, *Though ſuch a diſcerning was given at times to the Prophets and Apoſtles, and others extraordinarily endued, whereby to know Mens inward States, without regard had to their Fruits, yet the general way that Chriſt hath given, whereby to know Men, is by their Fruits of Words and Works, whether Good or Evil. Anſw.* Surely he makes meer Babies of Men of other Perſwaſions, if they may not be ſuppoſed to know as well as himſelf, that at times extraordinary Men have been extraordinarily qualified. Nor was it in debate then between him and his Antagoniſts, whether the Prophets and Apoſtles had the Gift of diſcerning the True Miniſters and Members from the Falſe, but whether it be a *remaining* Gift to this day: So that his varying the Terms from the *preſent* time to the time *paſt*, is a meer Sophiſtical Shift, who when he gives his former words, hath it [is] when he makes his Inference, hath it [was.] Whoſe Sence formerly relating thereto is given *Imm. Rev.* p. 179 to 183. and p. 188 to 191. which *T. E.* hath laid before him in his *Truth Defended*, p. 47 to 50. and *G. K.* hath not yet retracted. He in p. 179. thus hath it, 'Whereas they ſay, The 'Tree may be known by its Fruits, and it is ſo, but by 'what are the Fruits known? Two Men may be found 'doing the ſame outward Work, which hath the ſame 'outward Appearance, and yet the one a meer Hypo-'crite, the other a ſincere Chriſtian; Then by what

'can

'can their Works and Fruits be known?--These Wor
'which carry in them an appearance to be Good, a
'yet are not Good, but dead Works, empty, witho
'Life, though they have a fair ſhew, yet are they ro
'tenneſs within. And p. 180. The Works having b
'the Appearance, they are alſo ſeen and diſcerned
'be ſuch, and being Evil they caſt an evil Savour, b
'which in the Light, which begets the diſcerning, th
'are felt, and he can have no Union with them, n
'with the Tree, on which they grow; and this Ma
'diſcerneth in the Manifeſtation of the Light, both h
'own and his Neighbour's Works, of what Nature the
'are; by the taſting and ſmelling of the Fruit the Tr
'is known. And a little lower he adds, Hereto I gi
'my Teſtimony, that there is ſuch a thing, and I D
'WITNESS IT in my meaſure, *&c.* This ſho
touch is enough to ſhew what the Man held formerl
and pretended to witneſs in his meaſure, though no
being gone from the Light in which the diſcerning
received, and from that meaſure he then witneſſed,
now wrangleth againſt it, for he ſaith,

Whatever inward Senſe or Diſcerning any may pretend have of another Man's Spirit being bad, yet we find no warrant from Scripture to receive an Accuſation againſt any far leſs a poſitive Judgment, without plain evidence of Matter of Fact againſt them, by credible Witneſſes, 1 Tim. 5. 1

Anſw. *Accuſation* implies an *Accuſer*, and this reſpec outward Converſation: But what is this to the Inſtanc of a Man's Spirit being bad, or to thoſe outwar Works, which he ſaid in the Citation above, had th *ſame* outward Appearance, and yet the one might be *meer Hypocrite*, the other a *ſincere Chriſtian?* As he the queried, *By what can their Works and Fruits be known?* S may I, By what Evidence from without can they be co victed, when the Charge relates only to the Man's Sp rit being bad, even when his Converſation is not a

cuſed

cuſed? For where Matter of Fact, as *without*, is objected; the Evidence muſt be correſpondent; but where the Fruit and Taſte *is inward*, the Evidence and Demonſtration is *alſo inward*. But *G. K.* upon theſe falſe Premiſes, labours to detect the ill Conſequences of *Mens being judged to be of a wrong Spirit, only by the pretended diſcerning of Spirits*. *Anſw.* If it be *only* pretended, not real, this doth not deſtroy the Doctrine, or render it unſound, becauſe abuſed by ill Men, any more than pretending the Spirit is the Rule, is an unſound Principle in it ſelf, becauſe ſome pretend thereto, and act contrary. Again, How came none of all this to be foreſeen and fenced againſt by himſelf formerly, when he gave Teſtimony, and that even from his own Experience, to ſuch a Taſte, Savour and diſcerning of the Works that had the ſame outward Appearance, yet the one *good*, the other *rotten* within? Why did he not thus, even then, diſtinguiſh between the Pretence, and what was Real, to make void the Judgment, which is the Product of that Reliſh, of that Dis-union, if he thought Men with whom *we can have no Union*, (they are his own words above) ought not to be judged, to be of a bad Spirit, or that we may not declare, we have no Union with them?

He adds at the cloſe, *And even to know Men by their Fruits is a Gift of the Spirit, and proceedeth from a true Spiritual diſcerning, that is given in ſome meaſure Univerſally to all the Faithful, though they have not always ſuch due uſe of it, but they may be and are at times miſtaken.* *Anſw.* If theſe Fruits be outward Fruits, viſibly evil or good Fruits, that the very Wicked have a diſcerning of: But if the Fruits be inward, perceptible by the inward Senſes, the moſt extraordinary Endowments judgeth not without them. *By their Fruits ye ſhall know them* (even them *who come in Sheeps clothing, but are inwardly ravening Wolves*) ſaid Chriſt to the very Apoſtles, *Matt.*

Mat 7. 15, 16. *i.e.* Ye shall taste them, ye shall savour them, ye shall see through the Sheeps clothing, the outward Appearance, to the inward ravening wolfish Nature: That being the way by which alone the most experienced discern the inward State of any. As well as to assert formerly an infallible way of discerning the true Ministers and Members from the false is given; and now, that there is not enough of it given to all the Faithful to keep them out of Mistakes, shews how confused the Man is in his present Shiftings and Shufflings.

§. 4. Whereas he had said, *Imm. Rev.* p. 12. 'This 'Seed groweth up into a perfect substantial Birth, 'which is Christ formed within, the Body of Christ, 'his Flesh and Blood which cometh down from Heaven, 'and giveth Life unto Man which eateth it.---And it is 'called the Body and Flesh and Blood of Christ, because 'his eternal Life and Spirit dwelleth in it immediately.' He here bids us *Note, By this perfect substantial Birth he did not mean (as he now doth not) any Substance NEW LY PRODUCED---but only a vital Union of Substantial Principles formerly existing. Answ.* A *Substance* then he allows it to be, but not *newly produced.* Was that the Matter in debate then, Whether the Substance was newly produced, or no? or Whether it was a Substance or no? Or is not this rather an empty Shift, that he might seem to reconcile his former with his latter Writings, without retracting either? Had another committed such a Blunder, he had like enough to have been one of the first that would have reflected on him. But he now seems to forget what himself said *Ex. Narr.* p. 24. when he undeservedly taunted at *W. P.* who had administred no occasion, crying, *This is rare Logick*; and added, 'You know there should be no term or 'thing of Importance in the Conclusion of any Syllo-'gism or Argument, but what should be in the Premises.

Let

Let him therefore keep to his own Rule better, or never pretend to correct others Logick: For as is the Man's Cauſe, ſo is his way of defending it.

In p. 4. he adds, *Whereas I did call that inward ſubſtantial Birth, the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, I did ſo call it only by a Metaphor or Allegory, for with ſuch Metaphors, Allegories and figurative Speeches, the Scripture aboundeth in treating of the Spiritual and Divine Refreſhments and Enjoyments of the Saints, as when they are called Bread, Wine, Milk*, &c. *Anſw.* To this himſelf ſhall reply out of p. 14, 15. of the ſame Book, where having proved from ſeveral Scriptures adduced, that the Spiritual diſcerning is held forth under the names of all the five Senſes (of *Seeing, Hearing, Taſting, Smelling, Feeling or Handling*) he adds, 'But ſaith the Natural Man [ſuch an one as *G. K.* is now become, ſay I] Theſe are only but Metaphors and Figures [and then replies] 'Albeit theſe 'names be ſo, yet that hinders not, but the Spiritual 'Myſteries repreſented under them, are real and SUBSTANTIAL things, as really affecting the Spiritual Senſes, as the outward Things affect the Natural—And indeed theſe Outward Things are but Figures of the Inward and Spiritual, which as far exceed and tranſcend them in Life, Glory, Beauty and Excellency, as a living Body doth the Shadow; ſo that this whole viſible World—is but a Shadow in reſpect of the Spiritual and Inward. Thus far *G. K.* formerly, whereby it appears, that he then aſcribed the Shadow, the Metaphor to the Outward, the thing ſhadowed forth to the Inward: Now he aſſigns, on the contrary, the Metaphor, Allegory or Figure to the Inward, and the thing ſhadowed forth to the Outward; and yet he is not ſo Ingenuous, as to own a *Change* in his Judgment, but would render his meaning now and formerly the ſame. Nor hath he here only aſſerted that the Seed was a Subſtance, but alſo in his *Way caſt*

up, p. 60. (a Book printed *Anno* 1678, and as yet unretracted) hath ranked the contrary Opinion among the *great and woful Miſtakes and Miſconceptions of the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity*, who in his ſeventh Argument, p. 64. thus hath it, 'The Saints feel it in them as 'really to be a part or Particle of the very Subſtance of 'Heaven, *viz.* Of that Spiritual and Inviſible Heavens 'where the Saints live, as they do feel the Body of 'their Outward Man to be a Part or Particle of the 'Subſtance of this Outward World. And having de-'ſcribed this *Divine Birth* to be, *not only a Subſtance*, '*but a compoſed Subſtance of Body and Spirit*, he plainly affirms, p. 65. 'The Spirit is a meaſure of the Spirit 'or Soul of Chriſt the Heavenly Man. But if he will not believe what himſelf ſaid formerly, nor yet retract his manifold Contradictions and Abſurdities, 'tis to be hoped, the unbyaſſed and conſiderate will ſee him in his proper Colours, and that his Covering is but a Fig-leaf Garment.

But this Allegorical and Figurative Senſe (as he termeth it) *of Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood*, he ſaith, *ought not to divert our Minds, nor take off our Faith from Chriſt's Fleſh without us*, &c. *Anſw.* I readily grant it: For the *advantage* of that Faith (as *Paul* ſaid of Circumciſion of old to the *Jews*) *is much every way*, Rom. 3. 1, 2. Yet this excludeth not the Heathen, to whom the Hiſtory hath not been revealed, and who are the *Uncircumciſion that keepeth the Righteouſneſs of the Law*, Chap. 2. v. 26. from any Benefit thereby, though not an equal. This himſelf ſeemed ſenſible of, when in his *Light of Truth Triumphing* (printed *Anno* 1670, and not yet retracted) he ſaid, 'As many have ſuffered Hurt through the Diſ-'obedience of the Firſt Man, to wit, *Adam*, who hav-'not known expreſly, that ever ſuch a Man was, o-'the manner of his Diſobedience, ſo why may not 'EVEN MANY, receive Benefit through the Obe-'dienc

'dience of Christ in the outward, who have not expresly 'known his outward Coming and Sufferings, other-'wise *Adam*'s Disobedience were more effectual for 'Man's Destruction, than the Obedience of Christ 'were for his Salvation.

His following Assertion (*that to believe in Christ, as he gave his Body of Flesh outwardly to be broken for us, and his Blood outwardly to be shed for the Remission of our Sins, is the eating of his Flesh and drinking of his Blood, as well as the inward Enjoyment of his Life in us*, and that *this is clear from* John 6. 29, 35, 40, 47, 48.) I must a little compare with what he hath said elsewhere. In his Book entituled *Rector Corrected*, Printed *Anno* 1680 (a passage not yet retracted) he blames his Adversary p. 19. for saying, *He would prove that the Flesh and Blood spoken of*, John *6. are not a spiritual, invisible Substance*, retorting thus, 'Then what must we infer from this 'Interpretation of thine, but that we must eat visible 'Flesh and drink visible Blood? But hear him further, *ibid.* 'When the *Capernaanites* understood it of visible 'Flesh and Blood, he told them, *He that eateth my Flesh 'and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*, to 'signifie that it was an inward and invisible Eating, of 'an inward invisible Substance, whereof he did speak: For proof of which he then quoted *John* 61, 62, 63. at large. Again P. 21. he saith, 'Christ's giving his Flesh 'for the Life of the World, is more than to offer up 'his visible Flesh upon the Cross, for he giveth his Flesh 'to eat, and his Blood to drink, whereas many that 'believe Historically, that his visible Flesh was offered 'upon the Cross, do not eat his Flesh, and drink his 'Blood, for they have not Life in them, *&c.* So that with *G. K.* one while eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood, is an inward and invisible eating of an inward and invisible Substance, and it is proved to be so out of *John 6.* and his Adversary branded with *Capernaanitism*

for denying the Flesh and Blood there spoken of, to be a spiritual, invisible Substance: Anon, Christ spake there of a Belief in him, as his Body of Flesh and Blood was broken and shed outwardly (it is not *Capernaanitism* in him, it seems, so to assert, though it was in the *Rector*) and that very Scripture is referred to for proof, that he did so, and yet *G. K.* no Changeling the mean while, if ye will believe him; who not only acknowledgeth (*That the Flesh which he said they were to eat, and his Blood they were to drink, was that which he had before he descended*, Imm. Rev. p. 228.) but also in the foregoing Page hath it, 'That they did eat his Flesh and 'drink his Blood as TRULY and REALLY in 'measure before he came in that Body of Flesh which 'was born of the Virgin *Mary*, as the Saints have 'done since. Again p. 258. 'This Body of Christ, of 'which we partake, is NOT THAT which he took 'up when he came in the Flesh outwardly, but that which 'he had from the beginning, *&c.* See also *Way cast up*, p. 95. And thus referring my Reader to what may further occurr upon this subject when I come to my Sect. 3. §. 1. I betake my self to his next Paragraph.

§. 5. Upon his giving us §. 5. a Quotation of *Imm. Rev.* p. 36, 37. relating to Infallibility, that 'As it re-'lates to the Seed, Birth and Spirit of God, it is Abso-'lute, but as it relates to us, is limited and conditional, 'and is rather a Possibility of not being deceived, than 'an Impossibility of being deceived: He takes occasion to Query, *Why he or any of us should be ashamed to correct any unsound and unjustifiable words, which have dropt from our Mouths or Pens, by Human Weakness or Inadvertency, or why should any be upbraided and reviled, as Apostates and Changelings, for so doing?* To begin then with the last Clause, touching being upbraided and reviled as *Apostates*, &c. I answer, Whether our Charge (which he

he terms *Upbraiding* and *Reviling*) againſt him of Apoſtacy leans upon ſo weak a Foundation as he here aſſigns it, and whether we have not proved him ſo to be, I dare commit to the Impartial and Judicious, who have read our Books and his, and there leave it. As to the reſt I ſay, our Principle concerning Infallibility, which he hath ſo often vindicated, though of late he hath Scoffed at us for it, is no other than what himſelf hath aſſerted in the Citation above: Therefore hath he no need to quarrel with us upon that account, nor yet to *upbraid* and *revile* us (they are his own Terms) as he hath done therefore, were he (with us) a ſincere Profeſſor of the infallible Guidance and Leadings of the Spirit into all Truth. One inſtance of his taunting at us, I ſhall give out of his *Antichriſts and Sadducees*, p. 31. whereupon *G. W.* his giving relation of a Matter of Fact, tranſacted (as himſelf confeſſeth) about twelve Years ago, and uſing the words [if I miſtake not] he floutingly reflects, ſaying, *Is this like infallible* George Whitehead? Did *G. W.* then pretend to an infallible Memory? If not, Can he pretend ſtill to believe, that the Spirit and infallible Guidance thereof is a ſtanding Goſpel-Privilege, and yet will he make a Feaſt to them that are otherwiſe minded, and whoſe contrary Principles he hath ſo ſeverely cenſured, of the Doctrine himſelf maintains, like thoſe Vain People that make a Mock of the Spirit's moving? O Shameleſs Man! But what yet adds to his Ephah, and augments his Evil, himſelf at the ſame time was guilty of, *having aſcribed Arguments* (in his Book of *Univerſal Grace*) *to the Evidence and Demonſtration of the Spirit of Truth*, which now p. 15, 16. he acknowledgeth his *Sin and Error in, truſting* (as he there ſaith) *in the Mercy of God for Chriſt's ſake, for the Pardon of that and of all his other ſins.* So that had any among us taken the Name of the Lord in vain, and fathered upon his Spirit what was the product of

our own, *G. K.* of all Men (eſpecially if he ſtill believe the Principle, and be offended only at the abuſe of it) was moſt unfit to throw the firſt ſtone, while he had not retracted his, which yet he hath done to the gratifying of the Looſe and Prophane: Which Work will be his Burden, except he unfeignedly repent.

§. 6. His next attempt is, to varniſh over a Paſſage he gives us, §. 6. out of *Imm. Rev.* p. 54. thus, 'And 'though I cite Scriptures, and make uſe of them in Ar'going this Point, yet I can truly ſay, I have not my 'Knowledge from them; who had ſaid but a Line or two above (which he giveth not here) 'I have not 'fetcht them from my own Wiſdom, neither hath it 'taught me them. Now he bids us *Note, He ſays from them, as being the Efficient Cauſe, but he did not deny, that he had his Knowledge by them,* Inſtrumentally, *to wit, the Doctrinal Knowledge and Faith he had of Goſpel Truths, and Principles of Chriſtianity, for that is abundantly Acknowledged in* MANY PLACES (ſaith he, but he names not one) *in that Book.* *Anſw.* Were I to Argue the Point with him *Doctrinally*, and not rather evincing the Man's Falſe Allegations and Pretexts, I might query, whether the Belief that the Scriptures are true, was Communicated to him by themſelves, or Revealed by the Spirit Immediately: But of this, a touch is enough. Now in order to ſhew what he meant by the word [From] which he harps upon, I recur to what he ſaid a little above, with Reſpect to his own Wiſdom, that he had not fetched his Arguments from them, ſo neither from the Scriptures. Did he mean that his own Wiſdom was not the *Efficient*, but the *Inſtrumental* Cauſe, from which he fetched his Knowledge and Faith? Nay, that he did not: For in p. 55. he ſaith, 'God Dwelleth in the Light inacceſſible, the 'Mortal or Natural Underſtanding cannot Approach unto

'unto him—when it ſtretcheth it ſelf to know him, 'it is Confounded and Daſhed, more than if the Bo-'dily Eye would ſet it ſelf to look upon the Sun, *&c.* Again in p. 56. he uſeth the word [From] in the ſame manner, when he tells us, 'Words ſpoken from with-'out, though the beſt of Words uttered from Chriſt in 'the Days of his Fleſh, or from any of the Apoſtles or 'Prophets, and yet recorded in the Scriptures, cannot 'reveal the Father nor the Son neither, they point only 'at that which Reveals, *&c.* Where the Intelligent may perceive, he (in like manner) uſeth *from* for *by*, for the words were uttered *by* Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and ſo he muſt intend, or as great a Grammarian as he is, he muſt have writ Non-ſenſe: As well as that ſpeaking of the Scripture-Record, he ſaith, *They point only at that which reveals.* They did not then, it ſeems (according to him) *give* the Knowledge, give the Revelation, but point only or direct to that which gave it. Alſo in p. 57. after having denied that the Words of *Moſes*, the Prophets, *David*, *Iſaiah*, &c. could reveal God (who had a little before cited that Scripture, *Matt.* 11. 27. *No Man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son reveals him*) he Queries concerning Chriſt himſelf, 'Did his words reveal him, or his Fa-'ther unto them? Did they not miſtake him for all this (and I query, Were not thoſe *Goſpel-Truths* which our Lord preached?)— 'For their Eyes were held, were 'blinded, *&c.* Thus far out of *G. K.* formerly, even out of the immediately ſucceeding Pages, wherein I do not widely refer to MANY PLACES, I leave the Reader to ſearch the whole Book for it (and perhaps all labour loſt at laſt) as he doth; but give both Page and Paſſage. And now I leave it to the Reader, from whence he pretended to have his Knowledge and Faith formerly, and whether rather than retract what he then delivered, he hath not put a falſe Gloſs upon

his words, by an evaſive Interpretation contrary to his Senſe then.

§. 7. His next §. is deſigned to prove from theſe words of his *Imm. Rev.* p. 57. [Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, who ſpake to them in the days of his Fleſh Face to Face, did his words reveal him or his Father unto them] *That he then as well as now believes there is need of the Internal Revelation to give the Knowledge of Chriſt, and that that Knowledge was needful to all Mens Salvation (either explicitly or implicitly) elſe why ſhould he ſay, That it was needful to be revealed by the Spirits. Anſw.* I find no words there of the Knowledge of Chriſt, as he came in the Fleſh, but only of Chriſt as God, that God 'filleth all things, but is apprehended by nothing, but 'that which cometh from himſelf, is begotten by him-'ſelf, *&c.* p. 55. Adding towards the cloſe of the Page, 'It [the Carnal Mind] cannot by ſearching find 'out God, he dwelleth in another Principle, *&c.* And in p. 56. he tells us, how he is known, and revealed, *viz.* by the Son, for which he quotes *Matt.* 11. 27. And to manifeſt that no *outward, mediate Revelation can do it* (they are his following words) he in that and p. 57. inſtanceth, that 'the words uttered *from* Chriſt (as he hath it) 'in the days of his Fleſh, or from any of the 'Prophets or Apoſtles, cannot reveal the Father. Who in his Gradation deſcends to this Query, ſaying, 'To 'come to Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, who ſpoke to them in 'the days of his Fleſh, Did his words reveal him, or 'his Father unto them? But what is this to prove, that the Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, was needful to all Mens Salvation, either explicitly or implicitly, when as that was no ſubject of the Argument, but only of Scripture words ſpoken by himſelf in the days of his Fleſh, or by others before and ſince? Who (when he comes *to ſumm all that is ſaid in this Argument* (they are

his

his owu words, p. 70.) himſelf giveth it thus, 'The 'Knowledge of God [he doth not of Chriſt according to the Fleſh] 'being that which is indiſpenſibly ne-'ceſſary to every Believer and true Chriſtian, and ſee-'ing this cometh only by the Revelation of the Son 'immediately in the Heart, and by receiving it from 'the Mouth of God himſelf, and from the Inſpiration 'of the Holy Ghoſt, &c.) hath not one Syllable of the Neceſſity of the Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, but only of the internal immediate Revelation: So hardly is the Man put to it, neatly to varniſh over his Cauſe, and impoſe an untrue Explication, inſtead of a true one, upon his Reader.

§. 8. Yet he will be trying at it once again §. 8 where (citing out of *Imm. Rev.* p. 60. his having ſaid, 'See-'ing the Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh was not 'ſufficient, nor to be reſted in, but they were to look 'for a better, &c.) he tells us, *It will appear from the foregoing and following words in that Book, that by the Knowledge of him after the Fleſh, he did not mean that Knowledge of him as he came in the Fleſh, but that Knowledge that the Diſciples and Apoſtles had of him by their outward ſight and hearing of him, or by what they could know of him, by the meer actings of the Mind, without Internal Revelation.* Anſw. *Outward ſight and hearing by the meer actings of the Mind*, are foiſted in now, not mentioned there, nor deduceable from thence. Yet I obſerve how he varies in treating upon one and the ſame Argument: When he ſpeaks of Jeſus Chriſt's ſpeaking Face to Face in the days of his Fleſh, he applieth it to the Knowledge of him, as he came in the Fleſh; but when he uſeth the words [Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh] he did not mean the Knowledge of him, as he came in the Fleſh, but by outward ſeeing, hearing and the meer Actings of the Mind, &c. Yet all will not help him.

For

For having shewed, p. 59. That *if Christ's Bodily Presence was not sufficient of it self to minister—but a* MORE GLORIOUS *they were to expect—then far less the outward Administration of any other Man.* He in p. 60. adds, 'For if Christ be no more to be known after the Flesh, 'much less any other Man, but they were to look for a 'BETTER, a more clear and full Manifestation in 'themselves [to wit] a Spiritual, Heavenly, Mysteri- 'ous Manifestation in themselves, even such a way as 'the World cannot know him or receive him, which 'made *Judas* (not *Iscariot*) to wonder and question him, 'saying, *How is it that thou wilt manifest thy self to us 'and not unto the World?* By all which it will appear *G. K.* was not shewing that the Knowledge of Christ as he came in the Flesh, was needful to Salvation to all (as he alledged §. 7.) nor yet here treating of the Knowledge received by the meer Actings of the Mind without Internal Revelation, but was preferring the *inward* Manifestation of Christ in Spirit, to his *bodily* Presence in the Flesh; representing the outward Coming as *not sufficient* of it self, the other as *more Glorious*, Heavenly, full and clear, such as the World could not receive. So that instead of extolling the outward Coming, and setting off the Benefits thereof, he was rather magnifying the inward, and lessening the other.

Whereas he adds, *The true saving Knowledge of Christ is a spiritual Knowledge of him, as he came in the Flesh and died for us, so as by the inward Revelation of the Spirit of God, the Mystery of his Death and Sufferings is opened to us.* I answer, We deny not the unvailing of any Mystery to be a Spiritual Knowledge, nor yet that great Blessing and Benefits were purchased by his Death and Sufferings; but that such who have not had the opportunity and means of the knowledge of what Christ did outwardly, and have died without it, either are not saved or receive the Knowledge thereof in order to Salvation

hen dead, is what we have detected him, as contra-ictory to his former Writings in.

§. 9. From theſe words, *Imm. Rev.* p. 63. 'The glo-rious Goſpel is not the words, the beſt of Scripture words, (there he ſtops, referring from p. 55 to 71.) e takes occaſion §. 9. to declare, *His ſenſe was, that the ords of Scripture are not principally and chiefly the Goſpel, ot the principal thing of the Goſpel, but that* p. 69. *he calls he Light the principal thing---But as the Scripture words ithout the inward Life*, &c. *is not the Goſpel, ſo nor is the pirit and Light, barely and abſtractly conſidered, without he Words and Doctrine, the Goſpel, in the full and adequate enſe of the word Goſpel. Anſw.* I ſhall firſt confront him ut of what he hath more fully delivered in p. 63. than e hath here given, and then conſider his References. n the firſt place, he there ſaith, of the *Goſpel*, 'It is that which the words declare of, but not the words themſelves, which may be read, heard and known by the Unbeliever [of whom he ſaith] but the Goſpel he knows not, it is hid from him [and his reaſon is] for it is the Power of God unto Salvation, it is the Preach-ing of the glad Tidings of Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf IMMEDIATELY in the Heart, it is Chriſt's ſaying in Man, by the powerful Breath of his Spirit, *Awake thou that ſleepeſt*—He is the great Preacher of this great and glorious Goſpel himſelf. Now Reader what Conſiſtency is there between his *ſay-ng formerly*, the Goſpel is NOT the Words, the Un-eliever hath that, but the Goſpel he knows not, it is id from him, Chriſt himſelf is the great Preacher of hat; and his *now ſaying*, that neither the Scriptures, nor the Spirit and Light, is the Goſpel, barely and ab-ſtractly conſidered. He *then* ſaid Chriſt preached it im-mediately, he *now* tells us (a little below) *It cannot be conceived without ſome Form of Words and Propoſitions, that*

conſiſt

conſiſt of words inwardly conceived, and cannot be outwardly preached, without ſome Form of Words outwardly expreſſed whereby he confounds a *Declaration* of or concerning the Goſpel, with the Goſpel it ſelf, quite beſide his Sentiments formerly, *That it was ſpoken in Man by Chriſt by the powerful Breath of his Spirit*, which ſurely may be without a Form of words, as outwardly. The one to Unbelievers may read, hear and know, and yet not know the Goſpel: But will he ſay the Goſpel was never communicated by the Divine Breath, without a Form of Words, ſeeing he now makes the outward *Preaching* and the thing *preached* ſo inſeparable to the Goſpel, that neither of them are Goſpel in the abſtract? And where as he tells, *Imm. Rev.* p. 213. 'The Goſpel was preached 'unto *Abraham*, *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, and to all Be- 'lievers who lived before Scripture was writ in a Book 'and that it was ſpoken into their Hearts by the Spirit 'of Jeſus Chriſt, *&c.* Will he now maintain that they had both the Scripture Words and the Spirit and Light in order to make it Goſpel? Could not Chriſt in ſpeaking into their Hearts be conceived without ſome Form of Words, or was it not Goſpel till ſo conceived?

Nor will his Allegations from p. 55 to 71. and p. 69 ſtand him in any ſtead. For the firſt Reference is wide, no paſſage aſſigned, and though I cannot find any thing there to help him off, yet I find in p. 56. what makes againſt him, *viz.* 'The beſt of words uttered from 'Chriſt himſelf in the days of his Fleſh, or from any of 'the Apoſtles or Prophets, and yet recorded in Scrip- 'ture, cannot reveal the Father, nor the Son neither, 'they point only at that which reveals, and were ſpo- 'ken and writ for that end, that People might come 'to the Principle of true Knowledge in themſelves (ſee alſo p. 59.) Whence I Query, Cannot the Goſpel (which is the Power of God unto Salvation) reveal the Father, or doth that Goſpel point only at that which reveals

O

Or is that which reveals the Father, (which he ſaith the beſt of words cannot do) as it is opened in Man by the Son, no Goſpel, till outwardly preached or written? Thus for want of Sincerity to retract, and by labouring to defend as Congruous what is ſo Contradictory, is the Man entangled, and the more he toils, the more he is perplext. His ſecond Reference, inſtead of doing him any good, further lays him open. For though he doth there aſſert the *Light*, as the *Principal thing*, yet not *in ordine ad idem*, not with relation to the *Goſpel*, for which end he here adduceth it, for there was no Diſſertation thereof there. His words are theſe, 'One takes himſelf to read Commentators to furniſh him for the Miniſtry, another to read *Hypocrates* and *Galen* to become a Phyſician, while their hands are out from the Light of Chriſt, which gives true Knowledge and Ability to Miniſter either to the Soul or Body, and is the principal thing. Mark he doth not ſay it is the principal thing of the Goſpel, he was not defining Goſpel here, but what was the principal thing to make a good Miniſter or Phyſician; nor did he ſay, reading of *Hypocrates* or *Galen* was Goſpel in the abſtract, but the Light was the principal thing, or that they and the Light together make up the Goſpel in the full and adequate Senſe thereof. This I urge to ſhew the Man's Falſhood and Deceit, who offers ſo remote an Inſtance, and wide from the ſubject we are treating of, to prove that to which it had no coherence, and all to cover himſelf, that the Shame of his Nakedneſs might not appear, which now is ſo much the more viſible, by this freſh Demonſtration thereof.

From hence he ſallieth to a Diſcourſe about the Scriptures being called the Word of God. That he may ratifie our Adverſaries, he repreſents it *an unprofitable, hurtful and groundleſs Contention on our parts*, eſpecially his Friend *B. Cool*, having in a late Book of his ſaid, That

That *as they declare the Mind of God with reſpect to us, and are his Commands to us, they may in that reſpect be called the Word or Command of God to us: And ſo,* ſaith *G. K. all other Profeſſions in Chriſtendom own them, and no otherwiſe. Anſw.* Till he be more ſteady to what himſelf owns, I deem him no fit Voucher for others, much leſs for all other Profeſſions in Chriſtendom: Yet for the ſake of ſuch, to whom he labours to traduce us, we reply, We contend not meerly about Words, but ſome Men have erred in denying the immediate Internal Revelation is a continuing Goſpel-Privilege, ſo have they alſo in miſ-applying what hath been ſaid in the Scriptures, concerning the Word of God, whence it hath come to paſs, that as the Jews of Old *thought in them to have Eternal Life,* while not coming to Chriſt *John* 5. 39. ſo theſe not attending to nor coming to Chriſt, as inwardly revealed, have ſet up the Scripture as their Rule, in oppoſition to an inward Guidance by the Spirit of God in theſe days, aſſigning to them, what was ſpoken of the Divine Inſhining Words. Now to undeceive theſe, and direct them to an inward Principle in themſelves, our Friends have been led to this Diſtinction, not in Derogation to the Holy Scriptures nor through an Itch of Contention, but as a neceſſary Medium to fix Mens Minds upon that Word, which is able to ſave the Soul, and enlighten the Eye, which the beſt of Words could not do without it. Yet very unjuſtly was *G. K.* to fling this ſtone, who himſelf hath both uſed and defended this very Diſtinction in his *Help in time of Need,* p. 65. (a paſſage not yet retracted) for there he not only tells us, 'Though the Holy Scriptures declare of this Word, yet they are not the 'Word more than a Map or Deſcription of *Rome* or 'London, is *Rome* or *London,* or the Image of *Cæſar* 'Cæſar, or Bread and Wine is the Body and Blood of 'Chriſt, *&c.* But alſo allows, 'They may borrow

'th

'the Name, and ſometimes be ſo called, as the words 'or Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, is called by himſelf his Viſion, *&c.* He ſhould therefore have firſt retracted his own *unprofitable, hurtful and groundleſs Contention* (as he calls it in others) before he had beſtowed his Cenſures upon us. But the Man's *Malice* hath run him a-ground, who needed not, by this repeated inſtance, to have given freſh Evidence of his Inſtability (we having enough to load him with beſides, and more than he can fairly get from under) were he not judiciouſly infatuated, in his envious Undertakings, as a juſt Recompence from the Juſt God for his Bitterneſs and Apoſtacy.

§. 10. His tenth §. is ſpent upon a Typographical Error, and a groundleſs Reflection upon and calumniating his Adverſaries, which was ſo inconſiderable in it ſelf, *viz.* [thoſe Prophets] for [that Prophet] and ſo obvious to any intelligent Reader, as well as that it was never objected againſt him, that I know of, that I am perſwaded, he having ſlid over ſo many more conſiderable ones, which were his own not the Printers, he would never have touched upon this, but to uſher in a Slander. For after having told us, *Divers Typographical Errors are to be found in many or moſt of his former Books, which yet are obvious enough to the Judicious and Unprejudiced* (Why then did he not give an account of them, as well as of this, when his hand was in, ſay I?) he chargeth his *Adverſaries with making that a Typographical Error in ſome of their own Books, which is plainly obvious to be no ſuch thing.* But what proof doth he bring? What is that Error? And in what Book is it to be found? Muſt the Reader take all upon truſt from him, both that his are *obvious* to be Typographical Errors, and that ours are *not ſo*, upon his ſingle Evidence, on his own behalf and againſt us? And at the very ſame time that he was beſpeaking his Reader to believe

believe him, will he tell him, he muſt not believe us, and ſhew no Reaſon, but a Malicious Charge? Such Readers indeed his bad Cauſe ſtands in need of, but they will not help him. However this Outcry I take to be levelled particularly againſt *T. E.* for I know of none other aſſigned in any our Books, who in *Truth Defended*, p. 108. gave notice of a Typographical Error in a Book of *G. W*'s, *viz.* [to] inſtead of [for] which he found Corrected by a Pen ready to his Hand, and alſo ſhewed by the ſenſe that the miſtake muſt needs be in the Printer. Yet hath *G. K.* been ever and anon harping at it, that it was the Author's, calling it, *Poſtſcript to Groſs Errors, a dull, ſilly Juggle*, and in his *Ex. Narr.* p. 27. *a Trick of T. E*'s, ſo ſordidly would he *impoſe* what there is no ground to *ſuppoſe*, were not an *Error* more acceptable to him than a *Correction*. But this being again replied to by *T. E.* in his *Anſwer to* G. K. *his Narr.* p. 112. I refer thither.

§. 11. He had ſaid *Imm. Rev.* p. 74. 'Now the 'Bowels of the Father's Love ſtirred in Compaſſion to 'the Work of his Hands, that of the pure Creation in 'Man, which tho ſhut up in Death, yet it remained and 'periſhed not as to its Being—— and this is the loſt 'which God ſent his Son into the World to ſave, *&c.* Now in §. 11. he explains himſelf to have *meant thereby, the Soul of Man, that is a Created Being, and that he called it that of the pure Creation, not that it had not been defiled by ſin, but by reaſon of its great worth, in reſpect of its Original and Primitive State, and its near capacity to be cleanſed and purified.* Anſw. I might here ſhew that this is Doctrinally unſound, that Man's Body was Created pure as well as his Soul, that ſin defiled both the whole Creation (not the Souls only) *groaning and travailing in pain together, that the Creature it ſelf alſo ſhall be delivered from the Bondage of Corruption into the Glorious Liberty of the*

the Sons of God, Rom. 8. 21, 22. So that as Man's Sin *destroys both Soul and Body*, Matt. 10. 28. the Restoration affects both, but I chuse, after this transient Touch, to oppose *G. K.* to *G. K.* and shew what he then meant by the *Lost*, and that he did not intend the Soul of Man, as he here suggests. For in p. 71. he saith, 'When 'God created Man, he created him in his own Image, 'he put his Image, Christ the express Image of him-'self in Man, and he breathed in him the Breath or 'Spirit of Life, then did Man live indeed, he was a 'living Soul. By which it appears he did not then mean *by living Soul*, that which he now calls *a created Being*, but *the Soul of that Soul*, Christ, God's Image put in Men, who there adds, 'And the Light of Men 'was his Life, lived in him, *&c.* Again p. 75. after having declared *what is not to be saved*, viz. *The Old Adam, the Birth of the Serpent's begetting*, he saith, 'That 'which Christ came to save is that of God, which pro-'ceeded from him, the Seed of God in Man, whereof '*Abraham*'s old decayed Body and *Sarah*'s barren Womb 'was a Type. So that here's no mention of *Bodies* nor of *Souls*, but of the *Birth* of the Serpent and the *Seed* of God: And as what was spoken of the Birth of the Serpents begetting is not applicable to the Body, so neither is what was said of the Seed of God in Man, applicable to the Soul of Man, although in his next §. he would fain perswade us to be so imposed upon.

§. 12. Where citing the passage I gave above out of p. 75. he bids us note, *He calls the Elected Souls of Men the Seed of God* (upon which I Query, Were the elected Souls of Men the Seed of *Abraham*, for it was of the Seed of *Abraham* he was speaking, but he goes on) *The Hebrew hath it, Seed of God, see the Margin, and that I call it the Seed of* Abraham, *is only by an Allegorical Allusion, to the spiritual and divine Birth in the Faithful:*

Anſw. He ſhould rather have termed it an Allegorical Deluſion, or deluſive Allegory, or evaſive Shift rather: For it is plain he was ſpeaking of the two Seeds or Births, that of the Serpent and the ſpiritual and divine Birth, even of that Seed of *Abraham*, whereof *Abraham* and *Sarah* were a Figure, of that Seed which in the ſame Page he tells us, 'Chriſt cauſeth to fructifie and 'bring forth *Iſaac*, the Seed of Promiſe. So that he was not ſpeaking of the Soul of Man, nor of *Iſaac* the Begotten, but of the Seed, the Begetter, the Fructifier, which he terms, *ibid.* 'The Pure Principle of the Life 'of the Lamb, which died not, could not die as to its 'ſelf, but Man died from it, and it ceaſed to live in 'him---ſomewhat of a Divine Extraction in Man, whoſe 'Centre is not the Earthly Principle, but the Heavenly 'and Divine, *&c.* And in p. 76. 'The Body of Sin 'is a Burden to it, and ſo the Light ſhineth forth in 'the Darkneſs, to viſit the Seed ſhut up therein. By all which it is obvious what he intended by the Loſt God ſent Chriſt to ſave, *viz.* That Seed Man had loſt, Man had ſlain as to himſelf, and that by the Pure Creation in Man, which though ſhut up in Death, yet remained and periſhed not, he meant ſomewhat of a more noble Extraction in Man, to which the Body of Sin is a Burden, and not the Soul to whom it is no Burden, while it is ſhut up in Death. So foully hath he prevaricated in wreſting his words to what they will not bear, nor were not deſigned to bear, when given.

He goes on, *This was never intended by me to leſſen or obſcure that great Truth of the Goſpel, That the Man Chriſt is the Promiſed Seed of* Abraham, *in the true literal Senſe and without all Allegory, as he was born of the Bleſſed Virgin---and that Promiſed Seed of the Woman that ſhould bruiſe the Serpents head.* *Anſw.* What he intended is beſt interpreted by what he ſaid, except he would perſwade us that he ſaid one thing, meant another. I ſhall not there-

therefore think much to tranſcribe a Paſſage or two already given in our former Books, and not yet retracted by him. In his *Way caſt up*, p. 99. he ſaith, 'Though 'the outward Coming of the Man Chriſt was deferred, 'according to his outward Birth in the Fleſh for many 'Ages, yet from the Beginning this Heavenly Man, 'the PROMISED SEED, did inwardly come 'into the Hearts of thoſe that believed in him, and 'bruiſed the Head of the Serpent, and deſtroyed him 'that had the Power of Death, that is, the Devil. And in *Way to the City of God*, p. 125. 'Even from the 'Beginning, yea upon Man's Fall, God was in Chriſt 'reconciling the World to himſelf, and Chriſt was 'manifeſt in the HOLY SEED inwardly, and ſtood 'in the way to ward off the Wrath of God from the 'Sinners and Unholy, that it might not come upon 'them to the uttermoſt, during the day of their Viſi-'tation. For even at Man's Fall the Seed of the Woman 'was given, not only to bruiſe the Serpent's Head, but 'alſo to be a Lamb or Sacrifice to *attone* and pacifie the 'Wrath of God towards Men. And alſo p. 128. he Queries, 'Why might not Chriſt ſuffer in Men before 'his outward Coming, as he doth now ſuffer in them 'long after it? Again, 'The Seed hath been the SAME 'in all Ages, and hath had its Sufferings under, by and 'for the Sins of Men, in them all, for the removing 'and ABOLISHING of them. This I bring, not to entertain a ſtrife about words, but ſeeing he abſolutely told us what he ever intended, I demand the Intent hereof, whether he did not then acknowledge Chriſt's Appearance as a Seed, and the Effects thereof, both to reconcile attone and pacifie the Wrath of God towards Men, and alſo to bruiſe the Head of the Serpent, was previous to that of his being born of the Bleſſed Virgin, the which he knows to be that which we have all along pinched him with, out of his former

Writings, and which to this day he hath neither retracted nor defended.

§. 13. Whereas he had said *Imm. Rev.* p. 87. 'The Soul speaks to God in the Son,—Through him not at a distance but near: He now §. 13. saith, *His Sense was not at a discontinued distance, but both near and afar off. Answ.* This idle Shift will not help him, he is positive he is not a distance, but near, and adds, 'Where his 'living Drawings are felt, his eternal Power is felt 'making way for the Soul unto God, breaking through 'all the Powers of Darkness, *&c.* And is that Presence, wherein the livings Drawings are felt, *&c.* at a distance, absent, not near, even within, say I? Yea Christ is near as Mediator, 'He is Man's Advocate unto 'God, and there is none to intervene or come betwixt 'God and the Soul, but Christ the alone Mediator, to 'whom God speaks in his Son, said *G. K.* but a little above, and in p. 88. speaks of the *Appearance of Jesus to mediate in Men*, which could not be spoke of the Body received of the Virgin and now glorified in Heaven, for that is at a distance, not near; but of that Presence which is not at a distance, but near; even of him *who is the high and holy one that inhabits Eternity, with him also that is of a contrite and humble Spirit*, Isa. 57. 15. Nor will his Notion of a *discontinued distance* help him, but rather shew he is a meer Shuffler. First, for that it is no Scripture Phrase, 'Yet expresly delivered in the 'Scriptures, in plain expres Scripture-terms [therefore by his own Rule, *Truths Defence*, p. 170, 171.] 'should not be required by one sort from another, as 'an Article of Faith, or Doctrine, or Principle of the 'Christian Religion. 2ly, However it may hold in the Mathematical Science, with respect to a direct Line, which extends from the place near to another remote and afar off; yet here, *Ubiquity* being an Attribute not only

only of the Deity, but even of the Man Chriſt (according to his own Aſſertion, *Way Caſt up*, p. 130, 131. and not yet retracted) ſo that God and Chriſt are every where, not confined or circumſcribed to a remoteneſs, as in a direct Line, where one part is near, the other afar off, this diſtinction will not hold. 3ly, What he alledges out of *Acts* 17. 27. where Men are bid *to ſeek the Lord, if happily they may feel after him and find him*, reacheth not his purpoſe, *viz.* That he is not *at a diſcontinued diſtance:* It being ſpoken of the *Unfaithful*, and even to them God was not afar off; however they might be far from him, ſo as to feel and find him: For that which may be inwardly felt and found, is not far off.

But hear him again, *I did not intend in the leaſt*, ſaith he, *by aſſerting the Mediation and Interceſſion of the Mediatory Spirit of Chriſt in the Saints, to deny or derogate from Chriſt's Mediation and Interceſſion without us in Heaven. Anſw.* Neither do we. But what doth he retract then, if it be ſtill good Doctrine that Chriſt is Mediator in his inward Appearance in Man, as well as in Heaven? What hath he been hitherto contending with us about, in his ſeveral envious Pamphlets? Will he give up the Cauſe at laſt, and cry *Peccavi*, for his fierce oppoſing and ſlandering us as denying Chriſt's Mediatorſhip, upon this very foot, rather than retract this Paſſage? Or will he do neither, but twiſt and twine and wriggle in conſtant Inconſtancy, and neither *plainly* renounce nor *plainly* defend what he hath ſo *plainly* aſſerted formerly?

§. 14. He would perſwade us (if he could) §. 14. that by theſe words *Imm. Rev.* p. 99. [Jeſus Chriſt revealed in Man is the Foundation of the true Church] *He did not mean only and alone the Light Within, but that the true Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt, as he is both God and*

Man, and who as Man died, roſe and aſcended, &c. *is grounded upon him as inwardly revealed*, &c. *Anſw.* He was not ſpeaking of Jeſus Chriſt revealed TO Man, but of his being revealed IN Man, which is the Scope of his Argument from p. 99 to 129. Who in p. 101. ſaith, 'Chriſt muſt be revealed by the Father, before 'he became a Foundation, this is that which buildeth, 'which edifieth the effectual Working in every part, 'the Revelation of the Arm of the Lord IN Man's 'Heart. And p. 103. having told us that 'Whatſoever 'Church is not builded on this Foundation (Chriſt 'Jeſus immediately revealed both in the whole Body 'and every Member thereof) is not the true Church, 'but a Synagogue of Satan, a vile Harlot, *Myſtery Babylon*, the Mother of Fornicators, for the true Church 'is one in all Ages, and hath ever had one Foundation 'Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for 'ever. [Note this muſt relate to his inward Appearance only, for he had not taken Fleſh of the Virgin from everlaſting.] He proceeds to Query, 'What 'was this Foundation of the Church of God, before 'ever Scripture was writ, *&c?* [Was not that before his outward Appearance in Fleſh, ſay I?] 'Was it 'not Jeſus Chriſt the Word, which was in the Begin-'ning, *&c?* To which he anſwers, 'It was even the 'Word which came from God himſelf, 'and taught 'them immediately. Again p. 105. to prove that *Moſes* teſtifieth to this Foundation (Chriſt revealed in Man) he quotes *Deut.* 30. v. 11 to 16. which treats of the word nigh in the Mouth and Heart. And p. 107. 'The Jews and People of *Iſrael* who lived in *Moſes*'s 'time, and were SAVED [he ſaith] it was through 'Faith in this Word, in this Prophet raiſed up IN 'them, in their Hearts, not AT A DISTANCE, 'but nigh. And this [he calls] Chriſt in them, the 'Hope of Glory, the Myſtery hid from Ages and Gene-'rations,

' rations, but was EVER made manifeſt in the Saints. Again p. 112. he ſhews, that ' under the Name of Wiſ-' dom, *Solomon* manifeſtly points at this Principle and ' Foundation, Jeſus Chriſt the Wiſdom and Power of ' God: Then asks p. 116. ' Where is this Wiſdom to ' be found? How are Men bewitched from the true ' Path, where it appears, and how were we bewitched ' by them, ſeeking her without us? And now I leave it to the Reader to judge what *G. K.* meant by ſaying, *Jeſus Chriſt revealed in Man is the Foundation of the true Church*, and whether he hath not falſified his Senſe formerly, rather than he would retract what yet he dares not defend, who hath done it premeditatedly, moſt of theſe Quotations having been more than once laid before him in Print already, and argued upon, to which he gives the Go-by while he obtrudes ſuch an Interpretation of his words formerly, as theſe paſſages do directly oppugn, and takes no notice of what we have alledged out of them.

What he next offers out of p. 243 to 247. he pretends as a proof that *he did then own the Man Chriſt without us in Heaven, as our Head and Foundation, and object of our Faith. Anſw.* He ſpeaks indeed there of the Man Chriſt, who ſuffered in the Fleſh at *Jeruſalem*, his being the *Spring, out of which all the living Streams flow into our Souls*, p. 245. and that he is *to be prayed to*, p. 247. which none of us deny. But the queſtion being about the *object of Faith*, and this Quotation therefore adduced by him, to prove the Man Chriſt without us in Heaven, is the Object of our Faith (though that is not treated of in the Citation given) I ſhall ſhew what *G. K.* ſpake of the Man Chriſt even as *inwardly* revealed. Who p. 244. l. laſt, calls him ' The hidden Man of the ' Heart, whom *Paul* witneſſed that he lived in him, ' this he underſtood of Chriſt as Man, ſaith *G. K.* Which ſhews he there ſpake of him, as a *Spiritual* Man, but

the Body which the Jews Crucified he p. 245. calls ‘ That *Temple* in which the Fullneſs and Centre of Life ‘ did dwell. And in his *Way caſt up* (a Book not yet retracted) p. 102. he is yet more poſitive, that ‘ It is ‘ not the outward Fleſh and Blood that is the Man— ‘ but the Soul or inward Man that dwelleth in the out- ‘ ward Fleſh— ſuch as Chriſt was, even from the be- ‘ ginning. So that by this Poſition, when he ſpeaks of the Man Chriſt, he muſt mean not the outward Fleſh and Blood, but the Soul or inward Man, which was from the Beginning, and in time ſuffered in Fleſh, whom *Paul* and the Saints witneſſed in them, as Man, which he ſeemed to foreſee, when he tells us here, *Leſt any ſhould ſurmiſe, that by Chriſt Jeſus in all this large Citation, I did mean the Light Within only, and not the Man Chriſt Jeſus without us, I expreſly mention the Man Chriſt Jeſus without us*, p. 246. *who is aſcended*, &c. *Anſw.* He then ſaid, even in behalf of us, whom he hath ſince traduced, as well as himſelf, that ‘ We own Chriſt Jeſus, ‘ not only as God, but as Man, and that both inwardly ‘ and outwardly. [But] ‘ the immediate Fellowſhip ‘ and Union with the Man Chriſt Jeſus without us, who ‘ is aſcended, *&c.*— We have [ſaith he there] through ‘ the meaſure of the Life of Jeſus Chriſt, as Man made ‘ manifeſt in us. Thus he tells us the effect of the Faith wrought, viz. *Immediate Union of the Man Chriſt without us, who is aſcended*, is by the *inward* Manifeſtation of the Man Chriſt: Then ſurely that Manifeſtation muſt be the *Object of our Faith*, ſay I, *viz.* That which being preſented before us gives the Fellowſhip, gives the Union within as aſcended.

Yet ſo much Flouriſh doth he make upon this Quotation, that he angrily ſuggeſts, p. 10. *It is abundantly ſufficient to diſcover the Impudence of his late Adverſaries, who by perverting his words aſſert, That he made the Light the alone Object of Faith, which* (he ſaith) *he never did.*

Anſw.

Anſw. What we have charged, yea and proved upon him, on this head, he is neither ſo fair as to give, nor ſincere as to retract; therefore I ſhall (for the Readers Information) repeat ſome of them. For he not only ſaith (*Help in time of Need*, p. 66. ' The Object or thing ' which is miniſtred is Chriſt the living and eternal ' Word, nigh in the Heart, *&c.* Again *Imm. Rev.* p. 132. agreeing with both *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants, that God ſpeaking in Men is the formal Object of Faith*; he p. 151. repreſenteth ' the hidden *Manna*, white ſtone, and new name, ' as the Object of his Knowledge that overcometh, and ' [ſaith] none knows this Object but he. [Doth none know that Jeſus is aſcended, but he that overcometh, ſeing none knows this Object but he? But he goes on] ' What is the Object but Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, not only ' revealing, but revealed in the Soul, *&c.*?) But alſo in his Book of *Uni. Grace*, p. 80. (a Paſſage not yet retracted) from what was ſaid *Rom.* 10. 14. and *Pſal.* 62. 7, 8. 65. 2. he infers, ' If the Lord hath required them [the ' Heathen and Kingdoms of the World] to believe, ' then (Chriſt, the Name of God) the Object of Faith, ' the τὸ πίστον, hath been in ſome meaſure manifeſted ' and held forth unto them. Whence I Query, Whether he did not then make the Light Within (the inward Manifeſtation of the Man Chriſt) the ALONE Object to the Gentiles? Or could that be the Object of theirs or of the *Jews* Faith, which our Lord had not yet received of the Virgin, which was not Conceived, nor Born, much leſs aſcended? And yet they had Faith, and that Faith had its Object, yea and it was a ſaving Faith too. ' The *Jews* and People of *Iſrael*, who lived in *Moſes*'s time, and were SAVED, it was through Faith ' in this Word, ſaid *G. K. Imm. Rev.* p. 107. forecited. Let him then reconcile theſe Paſſages to his late Notion, that, ' Faith in Chriſt, as he died for us and roſe ' again, is indiſpenſably neceſſary to all; *Further Diſcovery*, p. 16.

p. 16. or never pretend that we pervert his words, when we ſhew he once aſſerted the inward Manifeſtation as the Object of SAVING Faith, even where the outward hath not been revealed: And there it is the only one.

§. 15. That Scripture *Luke* 15. 8, 9. concerning the *loſt piece of Money, he freely confeſſeth* §. 15. *is one of thoſe places of Scripture, he hath, through weakneſs of Underſtanding, miſunderſtood, and unduly applied to prove a Truth. Anſw.* Here is no retracting this (which is the firſt ſhew of Retractation I have hitherto met with) as unſound as untrue; No it was only *miſunderſtood* by him, and *unduly applied*, but it was *to prove a Truth*, he pretends. Let us hear then what he hath next to ſay for himſelf. Why it ſeems *in conſtruing the loſt piece of Money mentioned in this place to be the Light Within, he was too much ſwayed by the Quakers Authority.* But what Man of Senſe was he to be ſo impoſed upon in the mean while, ſay I? However now he is *ſufficiently convinced* (he ſaith) *Chriſt did not mean the Light Within, but the loſt Souls of Men, and he plainly now underſtands, that by the loſt Sheep, the loſt piece of Money and the loſt Son, is underſtood men, or the ſouls of men. Anſw.* He plainly underſtands amiſs, both in confounding thoſe three Parables together (for the loſt Sheep was loſt out of the Wilderneſs, *Luke* 15. 4. the loſt Son came back of his own accord, v. 18. and the loſt piece of Money was found in the ſame House where it was loſt, v. 8.) and alſo in underſtanding by the loſt piece of Money, the Souls of Men. Yet to enforce it, he adds, *They who expound the loſt piece of money to be the Light Within, will find difficulty to ſhew what the nine pieces are which are not loſt, whereas to underſtand it of the Souls of men, there is no difficulty in it. Anſw.* As Similies ſeldom go on all four, ſo neither muſt Parables be purſued too far, yet hence I take occaſ-

occaſion to demand of him, Whether there be no difficulty to find, who the Woman is that had ten Souls, kept nine and loſt one; or has the ſame Woman lighted the Candle, ſwept the Houſe, ſought and found one of her Souls in the Houſe, and what that Houſe was, where ſhe found the Soul ſhe had loſt? Surely Abſurdities will grow upon him thick and three-fold (as the Saying is) if we come to examine him throughout. However he endeavours to prove his Aſſertion, That by the loſt piece of Money is meant the Souls of Men, not the Light Within, from the *Womans lighting the Candle to ſeek the loſt piece of money, which plainly ſignifieth* (ſaith he) *that the way that the Lord uſeth to find the loſt Soul, is by lighting a Candle in it, and inwardly enlightning it, to ſee its loſt Condition. Anſw.* Firſt, The Lord can find the Soul without lighting a Candle in it, but he lights a Candle in it, that by the Light thereof it may find him, in and through that Gift of his Light, Spirit or Grace, which he had put into it, and which it, by departing therefrom, is ſaid to have left. Which if the Creature had totally loſt, ſo that its day of Viſitation were over, there had been no remaining ſpark in the Soul to ſeek it, nor had it received that degree of renewed Light, whereby to light the Candle, and both ſeek and find the loſt piece. Secondly, The very deſign of the Parable, was to ſet forth, *not* what God had loſt, *but* what Man had loſt, the Candle being uſed by Man, who needed it, not by God and Chriſt, who needed it not. Man was the loſer, he was to ſweep his own Houſe, in order to find what he had loſt, which was primarily the Divine Gift which God had given him and his Soul (or rather the Life of his Soul) but conſequently of that. And indeed *G. K.* himſelf more nearly hits the Scope of the Parable, in the Explication he here gives of what he had ſaid *Imm. Rev.* p. 125. the which he tells us, *T. Hicks* impoſed a perverſe Gloſs upon, *viz.*

That

That God had not loſt himſelf, nor Chriſt had not loſt Chriſt, but men had loſt both by their Sins. So little doth he mend the matter by his preſent Expoſition of the Parable. Yet to that degree is the Man infatuated, that what moſt deſerved notice, *viz.* His many flat Doctrinal Contradictions, he can glibly ſlide over; this which himſelf ſaid above, was a *miſunderſtanding, an undue application of Scripture*, and yet *to prove a Truth*, comes very frankly from him, as if he longed to expoſe his Folly and Unſoundneſs, which he had given but too great Demonſtration of before.

§. 16. His next §. is deſigned to correct his Correction of our Tranſlation, and that with reſpect to two Scriptures poſitively. That place 1 *Cor.* 2. 2. where our Tranſlation hath it [among you] he had rendred [in you] *Imm. Rev.* p. 126. Now he tells us, *Though the Greek words ἐν ὑμῖν can be grammatically tranſlated in you, yet they will not* ALWAYS *admit of the Tranſlation, otherwiſe in many places, the Senſe would be marred*, as 1 Cor. 2. 2. *and that that place* and Col. 3. 1. (He ſhould have ſaid *Gal.* 3. 1.) *are to be underſtood of Chriſt, as outwardly Crucified, and that the true Senſe of* Paul's *words* related *to the outward, which included his inward appearance conſequentially. Anſw.* As I am not entring into Debate with him of Doctrinals, but only to manifeſt his Incoherence and Inſtability, I apply my ſelf wholly thereto, and Query, If *Paul* preached Chriſt's inward Appearance only by Conſequence, incluſively, why did he but a few Lines back, *Imm. Rev.* p. 125. from *Col.* 1. 26, 27, 28. infer (which here he hath not retracted) that 'Paul preached Chriſt in them, pointed them to him 'in them, him Crucified in them, *&c?* (Was he in them by Conſequence only?) And why did he ſay alluding to the *Myſtery in the Gentiles* (*for ſo it is in the Greek*, ſaid *G. K.* then, and is he now better ſkilled in

in the Greek than then, ſay I?) 'This Myſtery is 'Chriſt the Myſtery in them, hid in them, the Trea-'ſure hid, and till it be found, it is not the Hope in 'them, but in them in whom it was manifeſted, it is 'the Hope of Glory? Will he ſay otherwiſe now? And will he pretend to demonſtrate it? For till then this paſſage (unretracted) is Evidence againſt him.

In what follows he gives out, That *he freely acknowledgeth his Weakneſs in Underſtanding, in ſtraining theſe and ſome other places of Scripture* (which he names not) *to prove what they did not directly and properly prove, the which undue Application of both theſe places* 1 Cor. 2. 2. and Gal. 3. 1. *both here and where-ever they may be found in any other of his Books, particularly* Uni. Gr. p. 42. *he retracts and corrects as above-mentioned. Anſw.* Though he ſpeaks of ſome other places of Scripture, yet I perceive he retracts and corrects but two, ſo that of *Col.* 1. 26, *&c.* lies ſtill, as a bar in his way. And this Retractation being bounded by the word [above-mentioned] muſt relate to the rendring ἐν ὑμῖν, in you, and Chriſt's being Crucified in Men, which is the whole of what is there alledged. So that it ſhould ſeem it is not Doctrines, but Explications of a Scripture or two, that he pretends to retract or correct. Nay he addeth in *general* terms (as if he deſigned to hide himſelf from his Reader, and play faſt and looſe) that *he remaineth in the ſame Teſtimony*, AS TO THE MAIN, *as to Chriſt's inward Appearance, and in all other parts of it relating to Eſſentials of Chriſtianity and ſpiritual Experiences, &c.* But what thoſe *Eſſentials* are, and in what branch or leſſer matter, he *relinquiſheth* his former Teſtimony, the Reader may gueſs if he pleaſeth, for Information he gives none. The Poor Man hath an ill Cauſe to defend, and the leaſt ſaid the ſooneſt amended, which I take to be the reaſon he ſhuns deſcending into particulars. Yet when he writes again, I would gladly know

know from his own Pen, 1ſt, Whether he now dare aſſert, that ἐν ὑμῖν can no where (throughout the New Teſtament) be, with good Senſe, as well as grammatically rendred, *in you*; and if any where, in what place, and how long he will ſtand to that Expoſition? 2ly, Whether *Paul* did not preach Chriſt Crucified in Men, even when he could not be ſuppoſed to mean his outward Crucifixion, as when he ſaith, *Rom. 6. 6. Our old Man is crucified with him*, and *Gal. 2. 20. I am crucified with Chriſt*, again *Heb. 6. 6. They crucifie to themſelves the Son of God afreſh?* 3ly, What other places of Scripture hath he ſtrained beyond what they directly and properly prove? For according to my meaſure of Underſtanding, he hath took time enough, ſince he firſt gave out his purpoſe of explaining and amending his Books, to have made theſe more Compleat and Intelligible, had he deſigned it, or were he a ſincere Convert, where he now hovers for Protection, and perhaps Promotion.

As dark is he in what follows, for *he remains in the ſame Teſtimony* (if ye will believe him) *as to all openings of Truth at any time given him of the Lord, and delivered in this or any other of his Books, therefore let none judge amiſs* (ſaith he) *of my free and Chriſtian Acknowledgment in this, or any other Miſtakes, that upon a further Diſcovery I am made free to acknowledge, retract or correct. Anſw.* What he accounts Openings given him of the Lord, and how long he will ſo account them, he is wiſe that can tell: For as he gives us no Catalogue of them, nay ſeems to expect, as I find from a paſſage p. 42. l. laſt of theſe, the Reader ſhould cull them out for him and he will retract them, if he ſee cauſe, ſo what he ſometimes gave as *Divine Openings*, he now denies to be ſuch, as particularly the Arguments drawn in his Book of *Uni. Gr.* he then *aſcribed to the Evidence and Demonſtration of the Spirit of Truth*, he now p. 16. *confeſſeth his Sin and Error in ſo doing.* Thus in him is verified the Saying

Saying of the Apoſtle *James*, Chap. 1. v. 8. *A Double-minded Man is unſtable in all his ways.*

§. 17. In the next place, §. 17. he gives us a piece of a paſſage out of *Imm. Rev.* p. 137. thus, 'Then they would turn their Backs upon them, and their Colledges would become like Abbacies at this day. Upon which he bids us *Note, The great Rudeneſs and Unmannerlineſs he ſaw in many of the Collegiants, and other Unchriſtian Behaviour in our Meetings, and elſewhere, drew his paſſage from him.* *Anſw.* Were this true (as it is not) it is a very raſh Cenſure, from the Miſdemeanor although) of *many* Collegiants, to propoſe the laying waſt of Colledges indefinitely, eſpecially if he then thought the Conſtitution was good, and the Fault only in the irregular Lives of the Scholars. But that this is not true, but a falſe Pretence trumped up of late to helter himſelf under, I ſhall appeal to the very Book it ſelf. He had ſaid, p. 136. 'That upon this Foundation of denying Immediate Revelation, depends their Church, Miniſtry and their WHOLE Clergy, and their ſo called Theology, and Philoſophy, Schools and Colledges. Then he goes on, 'For if once People were perſwaded and convinced, that God did teach and would teach them, who wait on him—then they would turn their Backs upon them, and their Colledges would be like the Abbacies at this day (which lodged that Prophane Rabble of Papiſt-Monks and Friars, who pretended as great Spirituality, as the National Prieſts do) an Habitation for Owls and ravenous Beaſts, ſee p. 136, 137. What Deceit was it then in *G. K.* to aſſign the Scholars Rudeneſs and Unmannerlineſs, as withdrew this paſſage from him, when that it was *not* it, but he had aſſigned *another*, viz. The denying Immediate Revelation, or the Teachings of God's Spirit? If *G. K.* can read this without Shame, I

am

am perſwaded the conſiderate Reader cannot without Deteſtation, that the Man ſhould obtrude ſo groſs an Untruth upon him. And in ſo much as he adds, That *he neither then was, nor now is, againſt Schools of good Learning, either of Divine or Natural things, but the abuſe and Irregularity of them.* I ask what he now calls Schools of good Learning of Divine things, whether thoſe Schools which he once would have had become an Habitation for Owls and ravenous Beaſts, thoſe *Theology* and *Philoſophy Schools* and *Colledges* which depend upon the denying Immediate Revelation? Are they now become Schools of good Learning with him? Or ought they now to be Suppreſſed? For that is the Matter in Debate, Whether theſe Schools be good, in order to make Men Miniſters of Chriſt, 'Whither (he ſays *Help in Time of Need*, p. 35.) 'Fathers and Relations ſend them to learn 'the Calling, as ever the Shoe-maker, or other Tradeſ- 'man paſt his Apprenticeſhip, and then becomes Free 'to uſe the Trade? This let him fairly retract or defend, it being the main hinge of the Controverſie, which he hath not dared hither to cope with, perhaps for the ſame reaſon, that the Chief Prieſts and Elders refuſed to anſwer Chriſt, whether the Baptiſm of *John* were from Heaven, or of Men: For the Man is in a *Dilemma*, he muſt pleaſe his Flock at *Turners-hall* at preſent (who perhaps do not yet think ſuch Schools to be good, to make Men Miniſters) till he can ſettle better to his Advantage, yet he muſt not diſpleaſe the Clergy, except he was ſure he ſhould never ſtand in need of them.

That many called Univerſity Men, have had (among whom he reckons *Wickliff*, *Luther*, *Cranmer*, &c.) *and may now have a good meaſure of true Spiritual Knowledge*, he pretends, *he dares not be ſo Uncharitable as to deny.* *Anſw.* What his Sentiments may *have been* or yet *are* of particular Men, I do not enquire, what they have been of the *Order*, of the *Degree*, is manifeſt out of the ſame

ſame p. 137. where he goes on thus, 'Then down 'ſhould all the proud, lording, lofty Clergy, with 'their many Degrees of Doctorſhips, Lordſhips and 'Maſterſhips paſs, who being Strangers to the true 'Knowledge, are vainly puffed up in their Fleſhly 'Minds, by the Form of Knowledge in the Letter, &c. This is it which I laid before him once before in my *Keith* againſt *Keith*, p. 143. and which he hath not yet retracted, nay nor took notice of here, though he gave us a Paſſage even now out of the ſame Page, which ſhews the Man had rather ſlide over it, than either defend it, and ſo diſpleaſe the Clergy he would now fawn on, or renounce and diſclaim it, as an Error in him formerly, and ſo be reputed a Man changed in his Judgment by thoſe few who hold with him, and would ſtill be reputed Quakers, *viz.* His Flock at *Turners-hall*, which yet recommends him not as ſincere to either. Nor will an excepting *ſome* out of a *general* Rule, while this Hand-writing is upon the Wall againſt him, ſatisfie any Men of Judgment, that are of that Order and Degree he hath thus reflected on, and who are not willing to be impoſed upon, that this is a reaſonable and adequate Compenſation, for thoſe Epithets ſo laviſhly beſtowed upon them, both in the place above, and elſewhere.

§. 18. In this §. 18. he gives us a new Expoſition (I never heard of from him before) of what he *did underſtand by the Hiſtorical Knowledge and Faith*, viz. *That Knowledge and Faith that reſpects the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Birth, Life, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion*, &c. *with all the Circumſtances of Times, Places and Names of Perſons*, &c. *as related by the four Evangeliſts, which elſewhere* (but he doth not ſay where) *he hath called the expreſs or explicit Knowledge and Faith, which many of the Faithful never had. But the Doctrine of Chriſt ſimply conſidered* (he ſaith) *is one thing, and the Hiſtory or Hiſtorical Revelation of the many Circumſtances of Times, Places and Perſons,*

ſons,,, &c. *relating to that Doctrine, is another thing*. *Anſw.* That this is a meer Shift, the Objection raiſed *Imm. Rev.* p. 228. which he gives not, and his anſwer will fully declare and evince. The Objection was, That G. K. *did not mention any thing of the Hiſtory or Hiſtorical Parts of Chriſt's Birth, Life, Miracles*, &c. (mark, he did not ſay of the *Circumſtance* of Time, Place or Perſons, but of the *Hiſtory*, &c.) *as being any Eſſential part of this new Revelation*, whereupon his Adverſary brands him with *Familiſm*. G. K. anſwers, p 229. by diſtinguiſhing the parts of Religion into thoſe *neceſſary to the Being of it*, and thoſe *not neceſſary to the Being of it*, which he thus ſummeth up, 'The Knowledge and Be'lief of the Hiſtory of Chriſt, his outward Coming, 'Birth, Life, &c. and of the other Hiſtorical parts of 'the Scriptures--are ſuch parts of our Religion and 'Faith, as are to make up the Intiredneſs or Fullneſs 'of it—But that the Hiſtorical Knowledge and Faith 'is not an eſſential part of true Religion [he inſtanceth in] '*Cornelius*, whoſe Prayers God heard, and yet he 'knew not the Hiſtory of Chriſt, nor of his Death and 'Sufferings, till it was preached unto him by *Peter* p. 230. By all which it appears what he then meant by Hiſtorical Knowledge and Faith, *viz. Not* the Circumſtances of Times, Places and Perſons only; *but* that Relation which *Cornelius* wanted, and for want whereof he denies (in his late Book ſtiled *Truth Advanced*, p. 4 and 70.) him to have received the Holy Ghoſt in his Gentile State. Who ſure muſt be very uncharitable to *Cornelius*, and the many Faithful who never knew all the Circumſtances of Times, Places and Perſons, &c. (as alledged even now) if they having the Eſſentials of Religion, and being deſtitute only of the Circumſtances of the Hiſtory, not of the Hiſtory it ſelf, muſt thereupon miſs of having the Holy Ghoſt, which is the natural Conſequence of this *new Interpretation* of Hiſtorical

Know-

Knowledge and Faith. Yet to make it yet more fully appear, hear him further p. 232. where he ſaith, 'In 'them who have not the Scriptures, the Spirit and 'Light ſufficiently teacheth them the parts of Religion 'abſolutely neceſſary, without the Scripture, to which 'parts the Hiſtory of the Scripture doth not belong. What parts are thoſe, ſay I? For the Spirit doth not teach the Knowledge of Chriſt's Birth, Life, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, *&c.* without the Scripture, (omitting Circumſtances of Time, Place, *&c.*) therefore he could not formerly mean, as he now ſaith, but his ſaying ſo now, is a falſe Pretence. See alſo p. 243. where he ſaith, 'True Religion and Chriſtianity may 'ſubſiſt without the Knowledge of Chriſt in the Let-'ter, to wit, In the Myſtery of the Life of Chriſt in 'the Spirit, and yet even here, where the Hiſtory is 'wanting [he doth not ſay the Circumſtance of Time, Place, *&c.*] 'the Myſtery or in-ſide of Chriſtianity is 'not without its skin or out-ſide, namely an outward 'Confeſſion unto God, *&c.* This I doubt not but he would now account *Deiſm* in us; but I obſerve, he did not then oppoſe Myſtery to Myſtery, but Letter to Myſtery, out-ſide to in-ſide, yea that he admitted of an out-ſide, *viz. an outward Confeſſion unto God*, which might ſubſiſt without the Knowledge of Chriſt in the Letter (which is more than bare Circumſtances of Time, Place or Perſons) even where the Hiſtory is wanting: And that in the Myſtery of the Life of Chriſt in the Spirit. So that then true Religion and Chriſtianity (with him) might ſubſiſt in the Myſtery without the Hiſtory: Nor was it the Debate between him and his Antagoniſt whether *all the Circumſtances* were *Eſſential* to true Religion, but whether the *literal and hiſtorical Knowledge* was ſo, which *G. K.* denied, as hath been already inſtanced.

Now upon his thus Expounding *Explicit* and *Implicit* Knowledge, he tells us, *He knows not any thing to be found*

in all his former Writings, to the contrary, notwithſtanding the Attempts of his Ignorant Adverſaries, who affirm it, and whom he hath ſufficiently Anſwered (as he pretends) *in diverſe of his late Books, particularly that called* Ant. and Sadd. detected. *Anſw.* This is a very nimble way of Purgation, to ſay he *doth not know* it is to be found in his Books, yet confeſſeth we have affirmed it, (but where he ſaith not) and alledgeth he hath ſufficiently Anſwered us, but for that he names but *one* of his Books particularly, and in that aſſigns neither Page nor Paſſage, that the Reader might be forced to take all upon Truſt, without Examination: And yet pretends in the Title Page hereof, that theſe *may at preſent ſuffice for a Reply to* T. E's *and my former and latter Books.* At this rate it is eaſie Anſwering whole Volumes. However if the Reader be diſpoſed to ſee what I have affirmed out of him, upon this Subject, he may find it in *My People called Quakers cleared*, p. 17, to 22. and *Keith* againſt *Keith*, p. 69, to 71. I Anſwered what he then had offered in *Ant. and Sadd.* with relation to his diſtinction of *Explicit* and *Implicit*, though he having now vamped a *new* one upon it, I have touched upon none but that here, and for the *old* ones refer as above. But he adds, *upon Suppoſition, that any ſuch thing can be found in my Books, I retract and renounce it*, which is Childiſh all over. Can a Man retract or renounce a Paſſage, *upon Suppoſition*, and not know what the Paſſage is? Or can we ſuppoſe him ſincere, and that he would renounce or retract it, if he knew it, when he takes ſo overtly notice of (and conceals from his Reader) the Paſſages from whence we have deduced his former Senſe with reſpect to the Knowledge of the Hiſtory and of the Myſtery? Again, if it be ſufficient to ſay, *upon Suppoſition any ſuch thing can be found, I retract and renounce it*, without aſſigning the Citations given, methinks he need not have been theſe 18 Months, poring

ring at it; but a few Lines by way of Advertisement, with respect to the many Contradictions and Absurdities objected against him out of his Books, *That upon Supposition they are to be found, he retracts and renounceth them* might have served: For this is the length and breadth of *G. K.* his Retractation here.

§. 19. His mis-paging a Place in *Imm. Rev.* hath led him to invert the number of his Paragraphs. I shall therefore, following the due order of the Pages, begin with his §. 20. *G. K.* had said p. 253, 254. 'When the Vital Energy and Influence of the Life of 'Christ is suspended upon the Soul of a Man, and ceaseth to act or operate, so as to give any sensible refreshment or enjoyment of it self unto the Soul, this is 'as proper a Death, as when a Man dieth, for when a 'Man dieth, his Soul dieth not in it self, but unto that 'Fellowship it had with the Body. This I have given more largely than *G. K.* hath done in these, who began only from the words [This is as proper a Death] after having *acknowledged* (not that the passage is *unsound*, for when did he ever say so? But *that it is unsafely worded, he retracts it*, he saith, and instead of that now averrs, *the union betwixt Body and Soul being broken, is more properly a Death, the other he takes to be understood rather figuratively than proper.* And his Reason is, *the Soul doth wholly cease to act in that Body while it is dead, but Christ ceaseth not oftentimes to act in a dead Soul, by sharp Reproof, Conviction for Sin and fresh Visitations, in order to quicken and renew it.* *Answ.* Were I to Argue the Point with him, I might tell him what he brings is not *in ordine ad idem.* The Soul's dying as to its Fellowship with the Body, are the *termini* of a Position, whence it is said to be *dead*; so in like manner its Fellowship with the Life of Christ being broken, is that which denominates it *spiritually dead*: But what is this to Christ his

acting in it (who is not dead, whatever the Soul be) by Reproof, Conviction or renewed Visitations, which yet may be (for ought that he hath offered to the contrary) by even renewed Vivifications or Enlivenings. This shews he states not the Matter fair: However as an Evidence of the Man's Mutability and Self-inconsistency, and present Darkness, I observe, that he who so lately unjustly Charged *G. W.* with Allegorizing away the Birth, Death and Sufferings of Christ in the outward, would do the like to the inward, rendring the breaking of the Union betwixt Soul and Body, to be more properly a Death than the other, which he now takes to be understood rather figuratively than proper. Whereas himself in the instance I gave above, §. 4. out of *Imm. Rev.* p. 15, 16. to the *natural Man* (as he there calls him) his *objecting that these* (the outward Senses of Seeing, Hearing, *&c.*) *are only but Figures and Metaphors*, asserts, 'That the outward things 'are but Figures of the inward and spiritual, which as 'far exceed and transcend them in Life, Glory, Beauty 'and Excellency, as a living Body doth a shadow [and 'concludeth] that this whole Visible World, with all 'the Glory in it, is but a shadow in respect of the spiritual and inward. And will he now say the *Name*, the *Denomination* is more properly applicable to the *Shadow*, than to the *Substance*, to the *Figure* than to the *thing figured?* Which yet is the natural tendency of his late halting Retractation, so bewildred is the Man in his Undertakings, and driven to his shifts to patch up his late Notions, without an effectual disclaiming of his former Writings.

§. 20. So having given us a Citation out of *Imm. Rev.* p. 256. where he had said, [Christ, according to his Spiritual Birth in the Saints, is the Seed of the Woman] which yet of late he will not allow us to say, he betakes himself

himself to this silly shift, that he did *understand it but Allegorically, and by way of Allusion, and never intended that Christ was not the Seed of the Woman, in the true and proper sense of the words, without all Allegory, as he was Made of a Woman, and Born of the Virgin* Mary, *&c. Answ.* But what then will become of his saying, *Way Cast up*, p. 99. 'Jesus Christ is the same Yesterday, to 'Day, and for Ever: Was he so only *Allegorically*, *by way of Allusion*, and not *really* and *properly* so? Or was he Born of the Virgin *Mary* from the beginning? He told us then, 'Yesterday is from the Beginning; to 'Day at present; and for Ever, in all Ages to come; [and added] 'This is the promised Seed, which God 'promised to our Parents after the Fall, and actually 'gave unto them, even the Seed of the Woman, that 'should bruise the Head of the Serpent. And there-'fore though the outward coming of the Man of Christ 'was deferred according to his outward Birth in the 'Flesh, for many Ages, yet from the beginning this 'Heavenly Man, the Promised Seed, did inwardly come 'into the Hearts of those that believed in him, *&c.* And must all this be turned off as only Allegorical, and by way of Allusion? Were not himself under a *Delusion*, he would say otherwise.

Having told us his *present and former Belief, that by* Gen. 3. 14. *Christ's Birth after the Flesh was really intended* (which we question not, for one Scripture may have a *Literal*, and *Mystical* Sense, both *real*, both *proper*, as this hath) he adds, *But this Allegorical Allusion of Christ's Birth in the Saints I did not ground on* Gen. 3. 15. *but on* Mat. 12. 50. *and* Rev. 12. 1, 5. *Answ.* The tearm [Seed of the Woman] he must borrow from *Gen.* not from *Mat.* 12. 50. and *Rev.* 12. 1, 5. and also that this Seed should bruise the Serpents Head, in the instance above. As well as that when he said, *Way to City of God*, p. 125. 'Even at Man's Fall the Seed of

'the Woman was given, not only to bruise the Ser-
'pent's Head, but also, &c. he must refer to the Pro-
'mise made, *Gen.* 3. 15. This he called *Hum. Rev.* p.
12. (as alledged above in my §. 4 and there Cited
by him, and observed by me, to which I refer as him-
self doth to what himself said in that § which I there
Answered) 'a perfect, substantial Birth of an Heavenly
'and incorruptible Nature, the Body, Flesh and Blood
'of Christ [and in his *Way Cast up*, p. 96. saith] 'the
'Saints in all Ages did feed on it. And seeing Christ
had Flesh and Blood from the beginning [he asserted
that] 'he was Man from the beginning, for as God
'simply he cannot have Flesh and Blood, for God is a
'Spirit, therefore it is the Flesh and Blood of Christ,
'as he is Man, or the Son of Man' [for which he Cites
'Christ's words] unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of
'Man, *&c.* Again in his *Way to the City of God*, p. 133.
he calls it 'the Heavenly or Divine Substance or Es-
'sence of which the Divine Birth was both Conceived
'in *Mary*, and is INWARDLY Conceived in the
'Saints. And must all this be now turned off as an *Al-
legorical Allusion*, as *improper*, &c? O the inconsistency!
O the variableness and unsoundness of this wavering,
fickle Man! Who having lost his Guide, is perplext
and entangled in Fetters of his own making, while in-
sincerely alledging and adducing false pretexts, to cover
himself with, which are too narrow and too short.

Thus having gone through his first Section, and
touched the most material passages, not designedly
overlooking any, although he hath omitted several, of
which I may chance to put him in mind of at the close,
I come to his second Section, containing his *Explanations
and Emendations* (as he calls them) *of passages in his
Book of* Universal Free Grace, *Printed* Anno 1671.
which how Effectually done, I now purpose to Exa-
mine.

Sect.

Sect. II.

§. 1. Waving then his Preamble which respects the Title Page, and hath been touched upon above §. 5. of Sect. 1. I begin with his §. 1. where he pretends to *remain in the same Testimony against that absurd Doctrine of absolute Reprobation, rendring Salvation impossible to the greatest part, or indeed to any part of Mankind*, and adds, *yet an Election even of Persons, as well as of the Divine Seed, I have owned*, &c. I shall therefore examine whether what he *now* owns be correspondent to what he *then* owned, seeing he here pretends not to retract any thing. Beginning then with p. 107. of *Vnl. Gr.* (which he widely refers to, without giving any Citation thence) I observe, that to Mens objecting from that Scripture [*I will have Mercy, on whom I will have Mercy*] that God hath not Mercy upon all, but upon some only, he Answers, 'These words relate not to Mens first coming into the World, but unto a time after, when they had despised the much Long-suffering of God, extended unto them, that after a time of Gracious Visitation, though never so small, he may have Mercy upon some, to give them a longer time, and yet not have Mercy upon others, to give it them.' The which rather makes against a Personal Election than for it, say I: For if God have Mercy upon *all*, but upon *some* only; it is in order that Election, the fruit of his Mercy, should extend to all (not to this or that Person only, or as Persons, but) as adhering to Seed found in that Divine Seed, wherein the Election stands: So that this makes not for him, but against him. And whereas he now tells us, that in p. 108. he follows the Common Translation of those words, *Acts* 13. 48. [And as many as were ordained unto Eternal life believed] the Reader will find, if he consult the place,

place, that he did not allow it, for he rendred it [whoever believed, were ordained unto Eternal Life, or ordered or placed into Eternal Life] which is both a Transposition and varies the Sense, *i. e.* they were not ordained to believe, but the Believers were ordained or ordered into Eternal Life. Whereto he there adds, 'Although the Common Translation should be admitted [he doth not say, he doth admit it, but although he should] 'it proves not what they intend. And thereupon he grants indeed, that 'as whoever believe 'are ordained to Eternal Life, so whoever are ordained 'unto Eternal Life, do believe [and so far *G. K.* gives in these, but what himself thence inferred he gives not *viz.*] 'which hinders not but that others may have 'had a Day of Visitation, wherein it was possible for 'them to have believed, but God did fore know that 'would not believe, and so he did not predestinate 'them to Life. Which again spoils his late Notion of *Election of Persons, as well as the Divine Seed* (for which end perhaps it was omitted by him) seeing the Election was not Personal, but in the Divine Seed: All others having had (as he saith) a Day of Visitation, wherein it was possible for them to have believed (then sure it was possible for them to have been Elected, and the Election was not limited to Persons, say I). To this he adds a third Reference out of p. 109. The Objection (which he gives not here) was this, that *from John* 6. 37. All that the Father giveth me, shall come, *some would infer that none but the Elect, who are given to Christ, can come unto him, and they all shall.* To which he Answers. 'There is a more *general* giving and a more 'special giving, which is only applicable to the Saints 'who are his Children, and cannot but come unto him. But what is this to prove an Election of Persons, to say the more special giving is only applicable to the Saints? Are *Saints* and *Persons* Synonymous Terms? Or is

Sa

Saints rather a *Qualification?* Such cannot but come unto him; but is that predicable of Persons indefinitely? Or only of Persons found in the Divine Seed, wherein the Election stands? So little doth he help himself out in his vain Essays to Reconcile his late with his former Sentiments: The inconsistency whereof I shall further make appear in an instance or two out of his Book of *Truth Advanced* compared with a passage or two out of *Un. Grace.*

Who in p. 105. of *Un. Grace* (having in p. 104. Asigned his Understanding thereof, *to be given of the Lord, by his Spirit*) thus delivereth himself, 'There are two Seeds, one Elect and of God, the other Reprobate and of the Devil—Who so now cleave to this Elect Seed in the true Faith, and persevere so to do, are chosen of him before the Foundation of the World, as fore-knowing and fore-seeing them in Unity with this Seed, which is Christ, in whom they are therefore said to be chosen, *Eph.* 1. 4. The Reprobate Seed is that Seed of Darkness and Unrighteousness of Men, which is of the Devil. They now which cleave thereunto, and continue in Unity therewith, until the Day of their Visitation from the Lord Expire, they are the Reprobates [and concludeth] 'Thus though the decree of Election and Reprobation be from Everlasting, yet it Respects Men NOT SIMPLY AS MEN, but as finally adhereing and cleaving to the Elect or Reprobate Seed. Thus far *G. K.* formerly, which how Reconcilable the *Understanding* (he then said) *was given him of the Lord, by his Spirit*, is his *late* Understanding, will be further Obvious upon comparing it with his Assertion in *Truth Advanced* Printed *Anno*, 1694.) p. 12. He there *Assigns it as an Error to say*, 'That the Elect Seed is only Christ, and the Reprobate Seed is only the Serpent or the Devil, and when any come into Christ by Faith, they come

'into

'into the Election, and may be said to be Elected, b
'not before, but when they depart from him, or a
'not come to him, they may be said to be Reprobate
And again, *ibid.* He reckons it 'Absurd, and contra
'to Scripture to say, A *Man may pass from Election*
'*Reprobation*, as if God's Election were a variable thi
[saith he, then adds, that] 'The Scriptures declar
'the Gifts and Callings of God are without Repentanc
Thus one while this variable Man declares, as *accor*
ding to the Understanding given him of the Lord by his S
rit, that the Election and Reprobation are in the t
Seeds, the decree of Election and Reprobation respe
not Men, *Simply as Men*, but as finally adhering a
cleaving to one of the two Seeds: Another while, i
an Error to Assert, the Elect Seed is only Christ, a
the Reprobate Seed is only the Devil, and that M
may come into, or depart from the Election. N
there is now no passing from Election to Reprobat
with him, without Falsifying the Text; and all t
from the same Pen, from a Man *not Erring in Fun*
mentals (if ye will believe him) but steady and ste
in his Testimony (*viz.* as any *Weather-cock.*)

x. Yet this is not all, for as I had in my *People called Q*
kers Cleared, p. 42. referred from p. 9. to 15. of
Truth Advanced, compared with his Book of
Gr. from p. 73, to 79. and p. 105. to the end, a
Indication of *G. K.* his Instability while treating
this Doctrine of *Election and Reprobation*, which he
took no notice of here, either to Retract or Defen
shall give an Instance or two of what he hath said,
Formerly and *Lately* concerning *Conditional* Election,
so leave this Head. In that Book of *Uni. Gr.* p.
having said [God willeth not all to be saved Absolu
but Conditionally (*parte Objecti*) upon their b
ving] and its being Objected [*either God willeth the*
believe Absolutely or Conditionally] he answers [we

C

CONDITIONALLY] Again in *Truths Defence*, p. 193. To *J. A.* his urging [That Christ Died for those that perish, Absolutely or Conditionally] *G. K.* answers [partly both] Again to *J. A.* his Objecting [That seeing the Condition it self, to wit Faith, is the Gift of God, he either bestows it upon them Absolutely or Conditionally] *G. K.* Replies to p. 194. 'God is willing to bestow it upon them and work it in them, not upon the Condition of their first Believing, before he give them to believe —— but the Condition is, if they do not finally resist his Spirit of Grace, *&c.* Thus far *for* Conditional Election: Now hear what he saith *against* it, in *Truth Advanced*, p. 11. 'As for that Conditional Election, (*saith he*) as it is not a Scripture Phrase, so it doth not agree with Scripture, but is contradictory unto it; for if such a Conditional Election were, it would be General or Universal, and comprehend all Mankind; for why are one part more than another, seeing Eternal Life and Salvation are held forth Conditionally to all? And from Christ's teaching, *That many are called, few chosen*, he infers, 'This cannot be a Conditional Election, for it would not be good Sense to say, Few or some are Conditionally Elected, saith *G. K.* All which I now leave with him, seeing he hath hitherto over-passed it, to reconcile if he can, and to inform his Reader, whether to say (Election is Conditional, and that the Condition is, if they do not finally resist the Spirit of Grace; and again to say, That Conditional Election is not a Scripture Phrase, but Contradictory to Scripture, it would not be good Sense to say, Few or some are Conditionally Elected) are both true, and no Contradiction? Till then, though I could load him with more upon this Subject, these may suffice.

§. 2.

§. 2. His next §. is very ſhort, what he had ſaid o *the Spirit of Life from God, its being entred into the T ſlain Witneſſes*, he would turn off, as ſaid only *by an A legorical and Metaphorical Alluſion.* But in this he is no plain, whether the Expreſſion it ſelf be Allegorical an Metaphorical, or his aſcertaining that time, *as alread begun*, only be ſo. For I remember the Teſtimony h hath given in this Book of *Uni. Gr.* p. 5. and elſewhere with reſpect to this and the Church being now com and coming out of the Wilderneſs, he hath Contradic ed in *Truth Advanced* p. 157, 158. of which more an in my Sect. III. §. 9.

§. 3. In his §. 3. quoting a place in *Uni. Gr.* p. he bids us note, That *diverſe of his Adverſaries amo the Sect of Quakers, with whom he hath had a great Cont of late, have from this paſſage ſought to infer his Agre ment with them, ſo as to hold that the Light within was ſu ficient to Salvation, without any thing elſe, and thereby only excluding all outward Helps and Means of Salvati but even the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and his Death, and Suffe ings and Sacrifice of himſelf, from being neceſſarily concer ed in our Salvation.* *Anſw.* As this is a Slander upon u ſo alſo hath he not attempted to prove it, offering Evidence, no Demonſtration out of any of our Book to make it out. 2dly, I cannot find that any of us ha ſo much as brought the Citation in p. 6. againſt hi For my part, I (who have been more particular Confronting him out of that Book, than any of them have it not; and it cannot be a *Typographical Error*, ſe ing the paſſage given is in the Page aſſigned. Yet buſie is he at Fighting as with the *Man of Straw* he ha ſet up, that he beſtows above a Page upon it, which t Foundation being wrong. (*for we deny the Charge*) ſerves not my notice.

N

Nor have we *blamed* (as he alſo alledgeth p. 18. upon his ſingle Credit without referring to any Book of ours) *his diſtinction between firſt and ſecond, Legal and Evangelical Covenant, given to both* Jews *and* Gentiles: But his late ſaying, That *even the Law within, both in* Jew *and* Gentile, *made nothing perfect, until the Faith of Chriſt the One Offering come to be revealed, by which One Offering he hath for Ever perfected them that are ſanctified* (as in *Truth Advanced* p. 71.) I have oppoſed to his ſaying (*Way to City of God* p. 125.) that 'through the coming of Jeſus Chriſt in the inward, even before he was outwardly come or manifeſt, many were *ſaved*, and attained unto PERFECT Peace and Reconciliation with God in their Souls. And to what he alledged in *Uni. Gr.* p. 8. *&c.* that 'the Goſpel lay hid within the Law, as within the Vail — that Chriſt Jeſus was in the Law and under it—that univerſally in ALL Men, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, there hath been both *Moſes* and the Prophets in Spirit, and alſo Chriſt. See my *Keith* againſt *Keith* p. 4, 12, 13, *&c.*

Nor yet have we blamed his ſaying, *None were juſtified by the Law, or firſt Miniſtration of the Spirit or Light within, or their Obedience thereunto, but thro' Faith in Chriſt* (which yet are not delivered, as deduced by us out of him) but ſhewed what he meant by Faith in Chriſt then, *viz. a believing in the Light*, 'nor is the outward Name that which ſaveth, but the inward Nature Vertue and Power which was made manifeſt in them, ſaid he, *Uni. Gr.* p. 30. who had ſaid p. 29. That 'in diverſe of theſe *Gentiles* the Seed was raiſed, which is that Divine Nature or Birth, by which they did the things contained in the Law, and SO were JUSTIFIED by him. Alſo in his *Poſtſcript* to *G. W.* in *Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 65, and 70. (Cited by me *Keith* againſt *Keith* p. 11. and not yet retracted) 'God was in Chriſt, reconciling Men to himſelf ever ſince

'the

'the Fall in all Ages, both before and since Christ suf-
'fered in the outward, having given them or put in
'them, the Word of Reconciliation, by which they
'who became renewed thereby were reconciled and
'justified in all Ages [blaming *R. G.* his Doctrine
that] 'no Men were justified nor reconciled, until
'Christ suffered Death in the outward, because then
'and not till then [his Adversary had said] was Re-
'conciliation and Justification wrought *&c.* to whom
also he assigns as an Error, the asserting, 'That Obe-
'dience to the Light within in the Conscience, is but
'the work of the first Covenant, and Righteousness
'thereof, and that no Man is justified thereby. By all
which the Reader may perceive *G. K.* hath not fairly
stated what we objected to him out of his Books, as well
as that he had no cause to say (as he doth here p. 19.
*That upon a diligent search into his Books, and an impartial
examination of all the places Cited by us to prove it, he could
find no such thing, as that he had formerly asserted, Men
might be justified and saved, without all Knowledge and
Faith of Christ without us, as he was Crucified* &c. For
what I have here laid before him (of which I have
Treated more at large in my *People called Quakers cleared* p. 26, to 31. out of his Book of *Uni. Gr.* p. 28, 29, 33,
34, 35, 36, 56, 57, 58, 115, 117, and 120.) are sufficient
to shew both what he formerly *called Faith in Christ*
and what *Faith justified* even the *Gentiles before* Christ
was Crucified, even a belief in the *inward Manifestation*
in the Word nigh in the Mouth and Heart, as *Uni. Gr.*
p. 34, 35. and abundantly elsewhere.

However there is a blunder of his behind (p. 18.
which having slipt over, I now return to, where he
saith *no Justification is by that Law, whether it be understood*
of Moses *his outward Ministration, or the same Ministra-*
tion of Moses *in Spirit, where the Law is writ but in Tables*
of Stone, till the Seed be raised &c. Upon which I Q.

ry, Whether the Miniſtration of *Moſes* in Spirit was writ in *Tables of Stone*, or the *fleſhy Tables of the Heart*? If upon the *former*; where were theſe Tables to be found? Who had the keeping of them? And who wrote them there! He had need have recourſe to his *Metaphorical Alluſion* again, and even that will not help him: But it is juſt with God, that ſuch as Fight againſt his Wrath, and are Bladder-blown with their own Learning, ſhould expoſe themſelves, that others may ſee (if they will not) that *Pride goeth before Deſtruction, and a haughty Look before a Fall*, Prov. 16. 18. Yet in as much as in the Citation above out of *Uni. Gr.* p. 29. I have ſhewed that he then allow'd that in *diverſe of the* Gentiles *the Seed was raiſed, and they were juſtified by Chriſt*: In as much alſo as he here recurrs to his *late* diſtinction of *Expreſs and Implicit* Knowledge and Faith (for which he widely referrs to his Book of *Anti. and Sadd. Detected* without either aſſigning Page or Paſſage, or obſerving that I have Anſwered him even with reſpect to that very diſtinction, in my *Keith* againſt *Keith* p. 62, to 71. which ſeems to be the τὸν φάρμακον, or Univerſal *Heal-all* of *G. K*'s Languiſhing Cauſe, brought in at every turn to ſtop a gap with, whether applicable or no? I ſhall tell him, *He that affirmeth muſt prove*, and if he will affirm thoſe *Gentiles* had an Implicit Faith and Knowledge, that *Chriſt was outwardly to be Born, Suffer, Die and Riſe again*, in order to their Juſtification, he muſt not *barely* alledge, *but* demonſtrate that they had it, either expliſitly or implicitly; which I have more than once put him upon, and he hath not yet attempted to do, as well as that I have ſhewed, that even then, ſeveral of the Citations given out of him (while unretracted) block up his way: Which I again preſs upon him, to do; whatever comes ſhort hereof, being meer Trifling.

§. 4. *G. K.* having ſo ſeverely as well as unjuſtly re-

 flected

flected upon *G. W.* (*Ex. Narr.* p. 39, 40.) as having *Allegorized away Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection, Ascension and coming to Judgment*, it might reasonably have been expected himself should not have exceeded therein, or at least, that he would have *corrected* and *retracted* his own, before he found fault with another. Yet when his own *Allegories* (or *Metaphorical Allusions* as he now tearms them) lay at his Door unretracted, hath he been casting the first Stone at another, so unjust is he. The instance before me (and which at length *G. K.* endeavours here to palliate in his §. 4. is in *Uni. Gr.* p. 9. where alluding to *Moses* his *putting a Vail before his Face*, he saith, 'The Word became 'Flesh, and dwelt in us, said *John*. And this inward 'Appearance of Christ in Flesh, is his Appearance in 'Weakness, as Natural and yet Spiritual, the Mystery 'hid within the Vail of Flesh, or Natural Spirit. Again, 'This is the Body of Christ that is indeed Spi- 'ritual, but for our Cause, descendeth into a Natural 'Form or Appearance— Thus it is sown *Natural*, but 'is raised *Spiritual*, and thus also we become changed 'thereby, both in the Soul and *Body*, so as being sown 'Natural we come to be raised Spiritual. And indeed 'there was no other way, that we could be made Spiri- 'tual, who were Natural, but that Christ Jesus, who 'was and is Spiritual, should become (so to speak) 'Natural. Hence he is called the λόγος ἐμψυχος, *i. e.* 'the Word Innaturalized, *&c.* This I have given more largely than *G. K.* hath done in this §. and leave it to the Reader to judge, whether the Allegory be not stretched upon the Tenters. Yet hence he bids us *note, Though he deny not the Flesh of Christ in the inward in an Allegorical and Metaphorical Sense* (but he once owned it to be *a perfect, substantial Birth, Inm. Rev.* p. 12. as I have observed already) *yet he freely acknowledgeth, he hath unduly and improperly applied that place*

Joh

John 1. 14. and 1 Tim. 3. 16. *to the Flesh of Christ in the inward, both here and in* Way cast up, p. 133, 134. *And that though he might possibly excuse it, to be only said by way of Allusion, yet even in that respect, he retracts it, as improper* (he will not say *unsound*, it seems.) *Answ.* But doth he also remember, that *before* he had pretended to retract it, that he had blamed another (though without a cause) for what himself, it seems by this Concession, was culpable of? Was he then *rectus in Curiâ*, fit to impeach others, if they had deserved it, while himself an Offender in that which he charged others with. Or is it not hence plain, that he was more quick-sighted abroad, than at home? Fastning that as a Deduction from others allegorizing of Scripture (*viz.* an allegorizing AWAY Christ's Birth, Death, *&c.*) which he would be loath should be imputed to him, as the *Consequence* of his own? So injurious a Detracter is he.

§. 5. Now from his saying, *Uni. Gr.* p. 9. *This is sown Natural* (to which he addeth in a Parenthesis, viz. *the Divine Seed*, while he omits what he had said of our being *changed thereby, both in Soul and* BODY, *so as being sown Natural to be raised Spiritual*) *but is raised Spiritual*, he bids us *Note*, §. 5. *This is but an Allusion, and was no wise intended in prejudice of the Resurrection of the Body, for in this same Book*, p. 70. *I plainly assert the Resurrection of the Body, as a thing not yet attained by the deceased Saints. Answ.* Although he hath been so far from granting it to us, in the like case, but branded us as *Atheists*, *Antichrists* and *Sadducees* upon this very account; yet I do allow, that as there are *Celestial Bodies*, and *Bodies Terrestrial*, 1 Cor. 15 40. So that the asserting the raised Bodies to be *Spiritual*, is not in prejudice of *a bodily* Resurrection. Yet I find it is not enough for him to say, in his own behalf, that *because Allusions in many cases are not safe, he wisheth he had not used it in this case*, but he must tag a Slander at the end

of it, viz. That *some great Preachers among a sort of* Quakers, *that are turned his Adversaries, do* WHOLLY *apply* ALL *that is said,* 1 Cor. 15. *of the Resurrection to the inward rising of the Soul or Seed within. And that one of their Ministers* (whom he names not) *could not be perswaded by him, that it was meant of the Resurrection of the Body after Death.* To all which I say, I less question his *Malice* than his *Veracity*, a Story supported *only* by the Allegation of a *professed* Adversary: Therefore if he would be believed, he must both name the Persons and bring a better Voucher: For I will assure him, he having so often laid to our Charge, what we never so much as thought of, and that even after our denying it, and putting him upon the Proof, that I shrewdly suspect he hath done no better by them whom he would fasten this Accusation upon.

§. 6. To what he had said *Uni. Gr.* p. 20. [That by that which may be known of God, *Rom.* 1. 19. is meant the Gospel] he in § 6. tells us, *he still holds, that in a figurative way of Synecdoche, it may be called Gospel, or as the word Gospel may be extended to a more general Signification than is commonly used in Scripture, he will not deny. Ans.* *A figurative way of Synecdoche!* Why what way of Synecdoche doth he know that is *not* Figurative, as much as he pretends to Learning? He would have paid us off, I trow, if we had committed such a Blunder. Again, he doth not here deny that the word Gospel may not be extended to a more general Signification, than is commonly used in Scripture. So then the Debate is not, it seems, whether by [that which may be known of God] be understood the Gospel, but whether that Signification be not more than what is *commonly* (mark, he doth not say *always*, but *commonly*) used in Scripture. And so it is the *common* Acceptation only of the word, as used in Scripture, that this *Logomachist*, or Word-

pecker

pecker is contending about, who yet ſcorns to admit he is any way *doctrinally unſound*, but only with reſpect an *undue application* of a Scripture or two, *now and then* will afford to emit a Retractation or Correction: And even of them he is very chary.

After the ſame manner he (in what follows) retracts his *undue application of theſe places of Scripture* (viz. *Rom.* 1. 16. *Col.* 1. 23. & 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. for he names no other here) *to the inward Principle, as to what it did or doth diſcover and reveal univerſally in all Men, and particularly in ſuch of the Gentiles to whom the Goſpel was not outwardly preached.* Which ſtill relates to and is bounded by the words [*undue application*] but whether the Goſpel hath not been preached to the Gentiles, who have not been under any outward Adminiſtration of the Goſpel, which is a *Doctrinal Point*, he reſolves us not, as if he deſigned nothing leſs than Plainneſs. Therefore I ſhall give a touch of what he hath formerly delivered argumentatively upon this ſubject out of *Uni. Gr.* p. 28, 29. and not yet retracted. Who having ſaid *it is evident, that this inward Principle was the very Principle of the Goſpel in them*, enforceth it thus, 'If the Gentiles ſhall be judged 'according to the Goſpel, then the Goſpel behoeved in 'ſome meaſure to be manifeſt unto them, for no Man 'ſhall be judged according to that which is not made 'manifeſt. This is ſolid Reaſoning, beyond an undue Application of a Scripture or two, of which more I ſhall offer at the cloſe of this §.

Now he tells us, *Upon a diligent Search into the Holy Scriptures, he finds that in all places in the New Teſtament, where the word Goſpel is uſed, it ſignifieth the Doctrine of Salvation by the promiſed Meſſiah, that was outwardly* TO COME,— *of which the inward Principle is but a part. Anſw.* Here he is out again, for the New Teſtament being written, *not* when Chriſt was outwardly TO COME, *but* after he was outwardly come, the word

[Gospel] there, when it signifieth the Doctrine of Salvation by the promised *Messiah*, must needs respect him as already come, not as TO COME. Yet he being so positive, that in ALL PLACES in the New Testament, where the word Gospel is used, it signifieth the Doctrine of Salvation by the promised Messiah, I shall in an instance or two shew, *G. K.* hath over-shot himself. First then, when *Paul* speaks, 2 *Cor.* 11. 4. & *Gal.* 1. 6, 8, 9. of them that preach *another Gospel*, are these some of the places, which upon a diligent Search, he finds, speak of the Doctrine of Salvation by the promised *Messiah*? Or will he confess, that the word Gospel was here used, to signifie something else? Also, when the everlasting Gospel was *again* to be preached after the Apostacy (for it seems by the word [again] it had been discontinued to be preached, although the History of Christ's Birth, Death, &c. had not), doth that place *Rev.* 14. 6, 7. mention any thing of the Doctrine of Salvation by the promised Messiah? There is not a word of that said there: but saying with a loud Voice, *Fear God and give Glory unto him*, &c. (being preached with Commission from on high) is called *preaching the everlasting Gospel*. Did *G. K.* in his *diligent Search*, over-look this? If not, how could he say, IN ALL PLACES in the New Testament, where the word Gospel is used, it signifieth the Doctrine of Salvation by the promised Messiah? I might also instance in *Rom.* 1. 16. (although he refuseth to allow it me now) that the Gospel cannot be said to be the *Power of God unto Salvation*, to the Believer, in any other Sense, than as it a powerful, energetical, inward Principle; for as it is *purely* Historical, the Ungodly have that Belief, though they want the Power. So that as the Power of God, is not a Belief or Relation *concerning* the Power: so neither (in a *strict*, *genuin* Sense) is the Gospel, which is the Power of God unto Salvation, *either* the Relation

lation it self, or the Historical Belief of what is related.

As he further asserts here, That *whatever Doctrine Men preach, or have at any time preached, the great subject whereof is not the promised* Messiah *to wit the crucified* Jesus, *as the main Foundation*, &c. *it is not the Gospel in the proper, full and adequate Sense and Signification of it, as the Scripture useth it*, (observe he doth not say, it is not the proper, full and adequate Sense and Signification of the word, *in any wise*; but it is not the proper, &c. Sense and Signification of it, *as the Scripture useth it*, so loth is he yet to retract any further, than an undue Application of a Scripture or two) so he adds, *that* Paul *in that place* (Col. 1. 23.) *meant the Doctrine of Salvation by Christ crucified, and the Grace and Gift of the Holy Spirit given of God to Men through him, and the other Apostles and Evangelists in that clear and bright Dispensation then given*, &c. Answ. *Paul*'s words were not so restricted, to that clear and bright Dispensation of the Gospel, as to go no higher. The Gospel he was speaking of, was preached to (or in) every Creature under Heaven; This relates to the time *past*, but in the other Sense it was never so preached to all Men *living* (whatever *G. K.* thinks it may have been to them after they were *dead*) therefore it could not be meant of the Doctrine of Salvation by Christ crucified, with respect to that clear and bright Dispensation the Apostles were under, but of that Gospel, which had been preached to (or in) EVERY Creature under Heaven. This Objection *G. K.* foresaw, therefore adds, *Though it was not at that time actually preached to all Men, yet it was begun so to be preached*, and that *after the Prophetical Stile, that which was to be done, is said to be done.* Answ. This will not help him, for first where that Prophetical Phrase is, or how it is used, he assigns not: 2ly. Neither did the Apostle speak of it, as what was then begun to be

preached, or of what was to be done; but of what was preached, was done; and that not only to a few, those the Primitive Christians preached to, but to (or in) every Creature under Heaven. It was an *Universal* Gospel, universally preached, *Paul* was speaking of, so that *G. K*'s Allegations are unsound.

One thing I shall take notice of here out of his p. 23, 24. relative to this subject, which may excuse my handling it there, where he takes notice, that *the Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the World, and that that is not the inward Principle only, but the Doctrine of Christ's Birth, Death,* &c.) instancing those words of Christ, *Where-ever this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached, this also shall be told, what this Woman hath done,* &c. *Answ.* This makes against him, not for him: For Christ did not say, Where-ever THE Gospel of the Kingdom, but where ever THIS Gospel of the Kingdom, shall be preached, *&c.* So that the Gospel may be preached, where *this Gospel*, giving a Historical Relation of Christ's Birth, Death, *&c.* may not, even without contradicting Christ's words. And that the glad Tidings, brought by them whose Feet are beautiful upon the Mountains, are Gospel in a secondary Sense, we deny not? Yet so, that as the outward and visible things are the Figures of the Inward and Spiritual (as *G. K.* hath asserted, *Imm. Rev.* p. 15.) so the name *Gospel* is more immediately and properly applicable to the Inward.

Yet in as much as *G. K.* still shelters himself under the tearms *undue Application of some Scriptures*, and acknowledgeth no Error in Doctrine, I shall give a few Instances of what he delivered formerly *Doctrinally*, upon this subject, in his Book of *Uni. Gr.* who to an Objection [that the Gentiles have not had the Gospel preached to them all this time by-past] thus answers, p. 20. 'Though the Gospel came not unto them *out-wardly*, by the Ministry of Man, yet it came unto them

them inwardly, by the Ministry of God himself. Again, Whereas our Adversaries denied [this Manifestation of God in the Gentiles is the Gospel, or any Manifestation of a *Saving* Nature] *G. K.* argueth thus, p. 21. 'If it were not Evangelical and the VERY GOSPEL IT SELF in an inward Ministration, it would quite render the words of the Apostle Impertinent—for *Paul* is here speaking what the Gospel was, and what was revealed in it, both to the Just and to the Unjust. So that it was not then delivered as a *Figurative way of Synecdoche*, according to his last Phrase, but the VERY GOSPEL it self, or the Apostle must speak *Impertinently*.' What! Had he not then made a diligent Search into the Scriptures? Or did they tell him one thing then, another since? But he adds, p. 22. 'By this Manifestation they did see the invisible things of God, and his eternal Power and Godhead, *&c.* But had they a Revelation of the Manhood of Christ, so as to have the Knowledge and Faith of Christ's Birth, Death, *&c.*) either explicitly or implicitly, seing it is not the seeing the Eternal Power and Godhead, that makes it Gospel now with him, without the other. If he will affirm it, he must prove it: If not, Why did he not retract this as a *Doctrinal* Error, and *unsound*? Again, p. 35. 'That these Gentiles, who did call upon the Name of the Lord, and were SAVED were not under any outward Administration of the Gospel [Surely this Gospel then was somewhat inward, under the inward Administration whereof they were, say I] 'is most evident [he saith] from the Objection framed by the Apostle, *Rom.* 10. 14, 15. and his answer thereunto. Who p. 36. explains what the *hearing* and the *thing heard* was. 'The hearing that Faith comes [he describes to be] 'a Hearing by the Word in the Mouth and Heart [and that which they heard or obeyed, was] not the Law or Light of Nature, but the Gospel

[whence

[whence he infers] 'So that the VERY GOSPE
'hath been preached unto ALL, otherwise they shou
'never have been charged with not having obeyed
This the Reader may find both more largely cited an
argued upon in my *People called Quakers cleared*, p. 27, 2
and *Keith* against *Keith*, p. 13 to 17. and by this ma
see that it is not only his Sense of some particula
Scriptures, but matter of *Principle* and *Doctrine*, where
we have shewed his Self-inconsistency, and which it ye
remains upon him to reconcile or retract one of them
and not think to lurk under some general tearms of a
undue Application of a Scripture or two, or as th
word is *commonly* used in the New Testament, and tel
us, as in his *Preface*, he neither *retracts* nor *renounce*
any one Assertion, contained in his former Books, that eve
was judged by him as an Article of Faith. For as wha
the Gospel is, is an *Article of Faith*, so had he retracte
his former Assertion thereof, he must have made th
Acknowledgment, which rather than do, how doth h
twist and twine?

§. 7. He gives in his §. 7. a passage out of *Uni. G*
p. 43. where he speaks [of the Lord's sending his S
into the World, both in the outward and inward—
that thus the Seed of the Woman doth bruise the Se
pents head] upon which he bids us *Note, I did not pla*
our Salvation wholly upon Christ's inward Appearance, b
upon God's sending him, both in the outward and inward,
bruise the Serpents head. Answ. Nor have we charge
him that he did: For 'tis one thing to place our Salv
tion upon God's sending his Son both in the outwa
and inward; and another thing to fix it so upon a B
lief and Persuasion of God's sending him in the ou
ward, that a Man cannot be Saved without that Know
ledge and Faith, even where the means of knowing
are not afforded, which is that we have shewed his fo
m

er and latter Sentiments ſo contradictory in. Yet one ing I think to obſerve here, *viz.* That he not only d in the ſame Page, where this Citation is given, hat Chriſt, even inwardly Crucified, is both the Wi- m of God and Power of God, unto them who be- ve] but a little lower, after having told us, 'The moſt proper and uſual Signification of the word *ν* to e [in] not [among, or unto] and that we are always o take the moſt uſual and proper Signification of the ord, where no cogent reaſon moves to the contrary, s none doth here (*viz.* 2 *Cor.* 5. 19.) he adds, 'Chriſt as not Crucified outwardly either among the *Gala- ians* or *Corinthians*, and the Riches of Chriſt, that *aul* told the Gentiles of, was not any outward thing, hich they were to find outwardly, nor did he bid hem go any where without to find theſe Riches, but reached God and Chriſt, and the Kingdom, and the Word near, even in themſelves. So that if *G. K.* be be credited (who hath not yet retracted this) when *ul* ſpeaks of God's being in Chriſt, reconciling the orld unto himſelf, and putting IN them (as he there dred it) the Word of Reconciliation, he was not ling them of any outward thing, or an outward Cru- xion, but of God and Chriſt's Kingdom and Word, r in themſelves. Will *G. K.* ſay ſo ſtill? Or will ſay the contrary? Nay, he will do neither, but drop as unwilling to appear open and plain?

He proceeds to tell us, *He did not underſtand, that the nging Men ſimply to the inward Principle, ſo as only to ve in the Light, Word or Spirit within, was a bringing m to the Chriſtian Faith, but that it was a proper means Preparation and Introduction*, &c. And a little lower diſtinguiſheth between the *Genus and Difference ſuper- ded*, and that *the true definition of a true Chriſtian takes both*, which is the Subſtance of what he here offers.

Anſw. What he once thought of the Gentiles, who had

had not the Knowledge of Christ, as he was to co
in the Flesh, himself shall declare. Omitting then
many Instances we have already brought out of his f
mer Books, I shall transcribe two, neither of them
tracted. The first I find in *Way cast up*, p. 44. wh
he not only allows, 'That whoever in any AGE
'Place of the World joyned their Hearts unto t
'Grace, and did believe and obey its Teachings,
'made them good and pious Men, but also in the n
Page corroborates it by a Testimony out of *Justin M*
tyr, thus, 'Such was *Socrates* among the *Grecians*, wh
'*Justin Martyr* in one of his Apologies, did expre
'call a *Christian*, and classeth him with *Abraham*,
Again, In his Book of *Divine Imm. R. v.* among
several Testimonies of the ancient Fathers, which in p. 1
he saith, *are owned by the People called in Derision Q*
kers, he gives this as one p. 158, 159. out of *J*
Martyr, 'That who liveth with or according to
'Word are Christians—as among the *Grecians*, *Socra*
'*Heraclitus* and many others: [and adds] 'Whe
'*Justin Martyr* calleth them Christians, it is to be
'derstood in part, that Christ was in part known
'*Socrates*, although we find not that *Socrates* had
'Knowledge of Christ, as he was to come in the F
'and suffer Death, *&c.* Now hence I ask him, Wh
is the *most distinguishing* Character of a Christian,
Genus, the inward Conformity to the Divine Wor
or the *difference*, some discriminating Token by
outward belief and Conformity, devoid of the inw
Subjection of Spirit? That they who have both, h
much the Advantage, is undeniable: But whet
where one is wanting, which is the best, truest
most properly a Christian, he that knows not t
Christ is come in the Flesh, hath Suffered, *&c.* yet li
according to the Word, or he that hath that Kno
ledge, and liveth not according to the Word, I le

every true Christian to consider: As also, Whether
h as live according to the Word, have been reputed
G. K. Christians in part, and know not that Christ
s to come and suffer in the outward, either are not
ved, or must have their Saving Faith given them,
er they are dead, as *G. K.* hath insinuated *Presb.* and
l. Chur. p. 112.

And now I am upon this subject, I shall take a step
what he saith §. 8. p. 24. and consider it under one.
at many were Saved by Christ, before his coming in the
sh, as well among Gentiles as Jews, I nothing question,
I never did, saith he. *Answ.* His former Belief I
spute not, his latter I have given out of *Presb. and*
l. Ch. p. 112. even now. So that if he believe *So-*
tes and others were Saved, who had not the Know-
ge of Christ, as he was to come in the Flesh out-
rdly, it is not that that Faith they then had, was
ing with *Eternal Salvation* (as he of late phraseth it)
they must either be born again into the World, to
eive it, in some other Revolution, or at least have
t Faith, they received not WHEN LIVING,
or after their Death. in their passage through the
lley of the Shadow of Death, as I have also observed
my *Key* against *Keith*, p. 108 and elsewhere. This
t we have more than once proved upon him, so that
present stating his Belief reacheth not the Matter
Controversie, and wherein we have shewed the Con-
diction between his former and latter Writings.

Now to return to his p. 22. whence I made this Di-
ssion, in order to prove that the bringing Men to
inward Principle, had been proposed by him as In-
ductory to the bringing them to the Christian Faith,
referrs us to his fifth Argument in *Uni. Gr.* p. 88 to
and cites a passage out of p. 92. the Scope whereof
s, a treating of the *true and only Method to bring Peo-*
to own the Scriptures, to own Moses, *the Prophets and*
Christ

Christ in the Flesh, his miraculous Birth, Doctrine,
This Method, he now saith, *he very well approves of*
for as the Knowledge of Christ the Word Incarnate or
Flesh, presupposeth some Knowledge of God and his Word,
to preach to People that are ignorant of God, and of his
vine Perfections, that there is a God, and what his Di
Perfections are, is very proper and necessary. Answ.
was at this once before, *Ant. and Sadd.* p. 27. and I
swered him in my *Keith* against *Keith*, p. 69 to 71.
of that he takes no notice here, notwithstanding he g
out in his Title Page, this Book of his may at pres
suffice, as a Reply to *T. E.* and my late and for
Books against him. Who, had he designed to h
been as good as his word, he should here have ta
notice of my answer, especially in as much as what
now offers is in effect the *same*, with what he
brought before, and I had replied to: But the Ma
willing both to cut his Work short, and that the *P*
should be bigger than the *House*, as if he were build
a second *Mindus*. That which I objected then (and
do) is that this Method of beginning with the Prea
ing of the inward, was *not only* with respect to the G
tiles, who were Ignorant that there was a God,
what his Divine Perfections are, *but even* with resp
to the nominal Christians, therefore it answers not
end adduced by him. That it respected even the P
fessors of Christianity, I prove first, from the Obje
on there raised, *That the Quakers have no Method*,
G. K's answer, 'That they have the best and only
'Method in their Words and Writings, first to
'People to the Light, *&c.* Now the Method used
us in our Words and Writings, being with respect
the so called Christians, his meaning must also relate
them. And when he adds a little below, 'It is
'want of this true Order in Preaching the Gospel,
'Men have had so little Success hitherto, and that
'L

'Lord hath bleſt it to us with wonderful Succeſs &c. it is plain he was not writing to or of the Preachers that were going to the *Indies*, among the Heathen, but to his Countrymen, that dwelt among us, and diſliked our Method, which he ſaid, *had been bleſſed with wonderful Succeſs* (and that was *here* alſo) the like he had ſaid *Way to City of God* p. 156, 157. wherein he aſſigns it as 'a Method, the Lord hath taught us to hold forth 'to People [to whom I pray, only to *Turks*, *Jews* and *Pagans?*] 'whereby they attain unto Holineſs, to a 'being made conformable to the Holy Life of Jeſus 'Chriſt, and come to know the true and great End 'and Uſe of his outward coming. Now as the knowing the true and great End of Chriſt's outward coming preſuppoſeth a Belief, that he was come, (for we are not ſpeaking barely of the witneſſing the inward Effects thereof, but of knowing the Uſe and End of it) this Method muſt needs be intended to relate to both, and not the *Gentile* only. And therefore *G. K.* is the more inſincere in alledging he ſtill approves of this Method, as if his Judgment then and now were the ſame, as it is not, as well as in reſtricting that to the *Gentiles*, which was not ſo intended, when given. What he builds here, upon this *falſe Foundation*, falls in Courſe.

§. 8. He begins his §. 8. with a touch at his late Expoſition of the *piece of ſilver*, Luke 15. 8. for which as he referrs to his Sect. I. §. 13. ſo do I to the ſame in mine. Then he pretends *firmly to remain in his Faith of God his making Salvation poſſible to all Men*, which hath been conſidered in §. 1. of this Section: At length he *acknowledgeth, that diverſe of the Arguments* (which is a pretty large reference) *he hath uſed to prove the Truth of that Principle, are not ſo proper and demonſtrative, nor the ſeveral places of Scripture, as* Rom. 10. 7, 8, 9, 10. Tit. 2. 11, 12. 1 Cor. 12. 7. *and that ſeveral Parables* (but he names none) *brought in Arg.* 10. p. 60, to 65.

ſo

ſo duly applied to that Effect. Therefore the undue applica-
tion of theſe places of Scripture, or any other that can be found
to that Effect (but who muſt look them up for him
Or when will he give them us? in the next 18 Months
Or ſome other Revolution?) *he freely retracts* (h
ſaith) *which though that neceſſarily reſpect the inward Prin-*
ciple of God's Grace, &c. *yet* THESE PLACES *are no*
to be underſtood only and alone of that, but reſpect that brig
Goſpel-diſpenſation, that had then appeared in the World b
the Apoſtles Preaching, &c. *Anſw.* This Retractatio
terminates, not to an acknowledgment that he wa
unſound formerly, (for when did he allow that?
wonder) but to an undue application of *three* Scrip
tures (the reſt the Reader is left to gueſs at) and th
divers of his Arguments (of which he particularize
but *one*, and out of that Cites no paſſage) are not
proper and demonſtrative, nor duly applied to th
Effect, which ſhews the Man would fain repreſent eve
thing, which he is fain to ſay ſomething to, as *Mote*
while *Beams* are the tearms he liberally beſtows upo
us, and that of things he falſly lays to our Charge. Ye
ſeing he now ſaith, theſe places of Scripture are to b
underſtood not only of the inward, but of the brig
Goſpel diſpenſation the Apoſtles were under, I Quer
what he thinks of that place of Scripture 2 *Cor.* 5. 1
(which was brought by him in that very Page 43.
Uni. Gr. out of which he gave us a Citation in this ver
§. and hath not retracted, though he could not chu
but ſee it) that *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World*
himſelf. Did it relate to the time preſent only?
[was] the *Preſent Tenſe* with him now? Or to th
time paſt alſo? And when himſelf ſaid (*Way to City*
God, p. 125.) ' Even at Man's Fall the Seed of the Wo
' man was given, not only to bruiſe the Serpent's Hea
' but alſo to be a Lamb or Sacrifice to *attone* or *pac*
' the Wrath of God towards Men, and this is the Lam
' th

'that was ſlain from the beginning of the World: Did he intend that this commenced only from the Age the Apoſtles lived in? Or will, he, upon ſecond thoughts, retract and correct this as unſound, which he hath never yet touched upon, though we have often laid it before him? For this is either *true* or *falſe* Doctrine? If *true*, then not limitted and reſtricted to the Age of the Apoſtles, and downwards only: If *falſe*, it is a *Doctrinal* Error, a *Fundamental* one, the faint tearms of undue Application will not do here, which I doubt not but himſelf foreſaw, with reſpect to this and many other places objected againſt him, and therefore deſignedly to have omitted them. Who, if he ever intend to be approved a *ſincere Convert* among the People whom he now ſeeks ſhelter under, muſt mend his Hand at it, or they muſt receive him upon very eaſie tearms.

§ 9. Before I enter into a particular Diſquiſition of what *G. K.* offers in §. 9. finding he words it darkly, as well as uſeth Deceit in the repeating of it, I ſhall ſtate the Doctrine delivered by himſelf, *Uni. Gr.* p. 69, to 72. and then Animadvert what he ſaith, upon what himſelf gives. After an Acknowledgment p. 67. that [*Adam* was at firſt made with an ability or power, to know and do the Will of God, which he loſt, by his Fall] he tells us in his 3dly, 'This Loſs is deſcended 'upon all *Adam*'s Poſterity— yet not imputed to them, 'before their own Actual or Perſonal Tranſgreſſion. Who Anſwering ſeveral Objections of our Adverſaries relating to Infants being Sinners, as deſcended from *Adam*, aſſerts p. 69. 'That there is a Seed of Sin tranſ-'mitted from *Adam* unto all his Poſterity in the Natu-'ral Birth—— but that this is not Mens Sin, nor im-'puted unto them, before Actual Tranſgreſſion [and p. 70.] that the word *Adam* is not underſtood of that 'firſt Perſon, whoſe Name was *Adam*, but of that ſin-

'ful and sinning Nature, which being derived from 'him, bears his Name. And in p. 72. 'If God hath *de 'novo*, or of a new, given unto all Men a sufficient Prin- 'ciple of Light and Life, to know and do his Will, 'then he may say, as in *Isaiah*— *What could have been 'done more unto my Vineyard* &c? *viz.* in Point of Righ- 'teousness— in giving that which was sufficient to ena- 'ble it to bring forth good Fruit, and consequently in 'punishing it for remaining unfruitful? And towards the close of that Page, he saith, 'Let the Scriptures be 'searched throughout, and it shall never be found, that 'Men are simply condemned, or made inexcuseable for 'Adam's Sin, but for their own Sins in the first place, 'and for those of their Ancestors but consequentially &c. This last Citation *G.K.* gives first, then inferrs from that other Citation [if God hath *de novo &c.* which he also gives] that he Argued from the Righteousness of God, not *simply* considered, but with respect to a *new* Dispensation after the Fall. To which I Answer, The new Dispensation is a Fruit of Mercy as well as Justice, extended to the Vineyard in order to its bringing forth Fruit, his Punishment afterwards is an Effect of his Righteousness; but God's not punishing Infants, who never sinned is an Effect of Justice, of Righteousness only. Yet that he may put a Trick upon his Reader, he jumbles these two Quotations together, (which spake of different things, the first, of a new Dispensation to Mankind, in order to bring forth Fruit; the second, of Infants not being condemned, who never sinned) and that in these words, *I did give* p. 72. *that none are simply condemned and sent to Hell, for* Adam's *Sin, for I cannot agree to that uncharitable Opinion, that any dying Infants perish, or suffer the Fire of Hell-fire, simply and only for* Adam's *Sin, what God in strict Justice might do is one thing, and what he will do, is another.* And now I desire the Reader to observe the Man's Falshood,

while

while pretending to give his own words, the Sense of which he hath notoriously perverted, fetching in what was written in the beginning of the Page, which respected God's Righteousness in a renewed Visitation, and expecting of Fruit, and clapping to the end of the second Quotation, which spake of the not condemning Infants, who never had sinned, those words [what God in strict Justice might do &c.] as if they had immediately followed in the Quotation, whereas they preceeded half a Page and more above, and were adduced to a different end. Which is such a degree of Notorious Prevarication and Falshood, that is rarely found in the worst of our Antagonists.

By this time the Reader may give a guess what the Man would be at; which till I had thus traced him, was very obscure to me. For his pretended *dissatisfaction with the method he had used from* p. 67, to 72. *in the way of managing this Argument* (which he calls) *effectual and solid in the main, as to the substance of it, yet not with respect to diverse weighty Circumstances in answering Objections against it* (which is all he gives, so much as leaning towards a Retractation) could give me no light into it: Who as he saith not that his former Arguments were unsound, but that they were effectual and solid in the main: So wherein *any Circumstance* is otherwise, he assigns not, but by his Legerdemain and Foul Play leaves a more open way for us, to track his Sense here, than in many of the foregoing; which Course is not to his Credit.

In his Quotation out of p. 69. he is not quite so gross. What he had there said of *a Seed of Sin, its being transmuted from* Adam *into all his Posterity*, he gives at large, with this addition [*I still affirm it*] what followed in that place [that it is not Mens Sin, nor imputed unto them before Actual Transgression] he takes no notice of, nor doth he so much as Cite it. But to

Excuse himself from *Answering all these Objections that are raised* (he saith) *about the manner of its conveyance and being transmitted, and by what chinks* &c. (he confesseth) *it puzzleth him.* And that is a wonder; he will allow any thing puzzleth him: Nor do I think he would have alledged it, but that he was loth to go too far in seeming to Contradict what he had delivered formerly. Yet at length, speaking of *Infants*, he concludeth, *they all need that God be merciful unto them for Christ's sake*, and therein I agree with him, but to different Ends: For I distinguish between *Mercy* and *Justice*; the not punishing Infants who have not sinned, is a Fruit of his Justice, the preserving them from sinning, by his Divine Seed, is a Fruit of his Mercy. And thus I close this Section.

Sect. III.

§. 1. He begins his *Sect.* 3. with a Quotation out of *Reason Corrected* (Printed *Anno* 1680.) p. 22. thus, 'By Christ his giving his Flesh for the Life of the 'World, we understand both the Offering up of his 'flesh, as his dying for us upon the Cross, and also his 'giving his Flesh to eat, and his Blood to drink &c. Which *distinction* I admit, *viz.* that his giving his Flesh for the Life of the World had a *twofold* signification; the one was *Propitiatory*, a Dying for us upon the Cross, as he hath it; the other, his giving his Flesh to eat, was *Spirit and Life*, and fed the Soul. And herein we agree with him. What he adds that *he did not place all our Salvation upon the Light within, excluding the Man Christ without* &c. *but that he did lay a great weight upon it*, is not the Matter in Controversie, as he hath been often told. We both lay a great weight upon Christ's outward coming, and do not place all our Salvation upon the Light within exclusive thereof: and also have not

charged

charged him with what he here seeks to purge himself from, any otherwise than as *argumentum ad hominem*, i. e. that we are no otherwise so than himself, who hath with us formerly born Testimony to the sufficiency of the Light, where the History hath not been revealed, distinguishing, as himself hath done, between the necessity that Christ should come and suffer for all, and of the Revelation of the History thereof, where the means are not afforded, its being indispensibly necessary to Salvation; to such.

Before I take notice of the Citation he gives out of *Rect. Cor.* p. 26. I shall observe what he saith to that passage of his *ibid.* p. 25. that *by his Flesh and Blood*, John 6. 50, 51. *Christ meaneth* ONLY *Spirit and Life*, which he *holds it needful to retract and correct* (as he saith) yet assigns it, as either *a Typographical Error*, *an Oversight in him, for want of due Consideration.* That it was *neither*, but a *Judgment* upon deliberation, and that he hath abtruded a Falshood upon his Reader, thus demonstrate, first, that the Matter in Dispute between him and his Adversary, would not be supposed to be, *Whether the words spoken by Christ, were Spirit and Life, or no.* Christ had expresly affirmed it, and the *Rector* doth not deny it; and it were idle to suppose except he had been so presumptuous, as to say so in (*eadem verba*) the *Rector* would alledge that when Christ said, they *were* Spirit and Life, that he meant they *were not* Spirit and Life: But whether they were so, might admit of Dispute. 2dly, As Christ had said, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing*, so *G. K.* gives us those very words: And to his Adversaries objecting *Spiritual Flesh cannot be broken, nor Spiritual Blood shed*, (which relates to the Spiritual Flesh and Blood *only*, for the other might be broken and shed) *G. K.* alledgeth the Scripture speaks of a *broken Heart*, and the *Holy Spirit's being shed*: Whereas had

not *G. K.* meant that it was *only* Spirit and Life, this instance had been wholly remote; and it had been enough to have said, it related to both outward and inward Flesh and Blood, and that the outward might very well be broken and shed.

To drive it yet more home I betake my self to his Citation out of p. 26. which shall give more fully than he hath done, *viz.* 'Although the Saints do not eat 'the Visible Flesh of Christ [he adds here, to wit, by the Bodily Mouth] 'and drink his Visible Blood, yet 'they partake of the Benefit and Vertue of both his 'Flesh and his Blood, and the Substance of both doth 'remain, which is his glorified Body in Heaven, and 'the Vertue of which doth really extend unto the 'Saints, both in Heaven and on Earth, by which they 'are Spiritually refreshed and nourished, as with Meat 'and Drink, and thus we do not divide Christ [here *G. K.* stops with an *&c.* but I go on] 'nor his Flesh 'and Blood, although a distinction there is betwixt 'that Flesh which he had from the beginning (and 'which the Saints fed on in all Ages from the begin'ing) and that which he took upon him in the Virgin 'Womb. From this latter, which *G. K.* would have concealed from us, I observe he allowed of a distinction betwixt the Flesh and Blood, Christ had from the beginning, and that which he took upon him in the Virgins Womb. Let him now tell us therefore, what the Flesh (which Christ had from the beginning and which the Saints fed on, in all Ages) was, besides Spirit and Life? Again, as he gave us not this part of the Citation, which he could not stumble over without some hurt to himself; so to what he did give, he foists in the words [to wit, by the Bodily Mouth] and in it proves it, as an Evidence that the word ONLY was *most an Oversight in him, that he did not intend that Faithful did not partake of the unspeakable Benefit of*

Flesh and Blood, that was outwardly broken and shed, but his sense was, they did not eat it with the Bodily Mouth, but by Faith, and that the Vertue conveyed may be said to be Spirit and Life, i. e. *had a spiritual sense and signification. Answ* What he said above, of the Saints feeding, could not be an eating *visible Flesh*, either with *bodily* or *spiritual* Mouth, seing it was a feeding common to Saints in Heaven and on Earth too: Nay the substance of the Flesh and Blood doth remain, even according to him, and what they feed on, is not on the substance even of Christ's glorified Body in Heaven, but of the Virtue which extends therefrom: And what is this Virtue? Is it not only Spirit and Life? However seing he is so fond of his addition [*viz.* by the Bodily Mouth] I desire to be resolved in one thing, as a Point of Philosophy, Whether if that which be to be eaten be Bodily, any thing but a Bodily Mouth can eat it, and whether if the Mouth be not Bodily, the Food can be said to be Bodily, for that a Corporeal Substance (a Substance, which is not only Spirit and Life, but also Bodily) should be fed on by an Incorporeal Mouth, is equally as inconceivable by me, as that a Corporeal Mouth should feed on an Incorporeal Substance. If *G. K.* resolve me this fairly, *vrit mihi magnus Apollo.*

§. 2. In p 26. of these *Explications* (for now I trace him by Pages, not by §'s) he alledgeth for *his having brought* (Rect. Corr. p. 29.) *the words of* Hilarius, *that it was to excuse* G. F. *and not that he did not believe that Christ had the true Nature of Man, consisting of a true reasonable, created Soul, and a true Body, for that he did always believe that he did partake of* Mary's *substance* &c. *Answ.* He hath not fairly stated the Matter in Controversie, as well as that he assigns not, where our Charge is to be found. That he had the true Nature of Man, as we our selves acknowledge, so have not objected it

against *G. K.* but whether 'Christ, who partook of 'the Nature and Image of Man from the Seed of *Mary*, 'did not partake of a Nature and Image much more 'Excellent, than that of Man in its greatest Glory, 'from God and his Seed, who did really sow a most 'Divine and Heavenly Seed in the Virgins Womb, 'which as it supplied the Males Seed, so it had much 'more in it, and brought forth a Birth that as it had 'the true and whole Nature of Man, so it had a Per-'fection above it, not only in accidental qualities, but 'even in Substance and Essence [they are his own words in *Way to City of God*, p. 131. and not yet re-'tracted] And again whether 'in as much that after 'Death it was not subject to Corruption, the Name 'Human be not too mean a Title, whereby to expres 'it, far less that it should be called so now, when it is 'glorified, and is *altogether* Heavenly and Spiritual, the 'Scripture no where giving unto his Body such a Name 'as Human, but that the *first Man is of the Earth, earth-'ly*; *the Second* Adam, *the Lord from Heaven*, 1 Cor. 15. 'Heavenly [as himself declares *Rect. Corr.* p. 27.] is that which we have of late laid before him, in opposi-tion to his late Carnal tearms of *Human*, *Humanity*, and imposing them upon us: Who have therefore *blamed the Word* Human, Humanity *and* Humane Na-ture, *as applicable to Christ*, because we did believe his *Manhood Nature* (as *G. K.* saith) *was more Excellent than that of other Men:* So that his *Judgment* given for-merly *of* G. F. *and others*, and which he here repeateth, as it was truly stated *then*; so is it the *same* still, al-though he now chargeth it without proof upon *divers Quakers* indefinitely (without naming any) that *they have used the terms* Humanity *and* Humane *with reference to Christ*, which till he be more particular, *who* have so done, and *where* as well as *how*, whether Controversial-ly, keeping to their Adversaries tearms, or as declara-

tive

ve of their Faith and approving of those terms, deserves not my further notice.

'*But he never thought* (he pretends) *that any of them denied him as Man to be a Creature, or to have been produced by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary, *as some of them have*, he saith, but who these *some* are, nor *where* they have so said, he declareth not, but after his *wonted* manner accuseth without offering proof: A blind way, sure, of Answering of Books, for so such he gives out this Book in his Title Page. Yet that Christ was Born of the Virgin, and that that Body was Created and consequently a Creature, we deny not, although that he was *produced by Coagulation, or by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary (a Notion started by *R. Cobbet*, answered to by *St. Crisp*, renewed by *G. K.* in his *True Copy* p. 22. and replied to by *T. E.* in his *Truth Defended* p. 134 *&c.* a Book *G. K.* is still Debtor to) is what we do indeed deny, as even *G. K.* hath done formerly. Who in *Reli. Corr.* p. 27. (besides what have offered even now, with respect to the Word *Human*) thus hath it, 'Even the outward visible Flesh which he took of the Virgin, seing it was not PRODUCED or formed by HUMAN GENERATION [then not from the Properties of Man in *Mary*, say I] but by a Divine Conception, through the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, and did far excel the Flesh of all other Men that ever were since—— the Name *Human* is but too mean a Title *&c.* Again p. 29. he quotes *Hilarius*, that 'Jesus Christ was not formed by the Nature of 'Humane Conception, and that the Original of his 'Body (which he affirmed to be an Heavenly Body, yet 'had of the Virgins Substance in it) 'is not of an Human Conception, that both the Soul and Body of 'Christ are of a more Excellent Nature, than these of 'other Men, although having all that belong to the

'true

' true Eſſence of Man, either in Soul or Body. And
ſaith further, ' Why is the Fleſh Conceived of t
' Holy Ghoſt judged by the Nature of an Humane Bod
Thus far *G. K.* out of *Hilarius*; which how reconci
able it is to that Notion, that Chriſt was produced
Generation of and from the Properties of Man in *Ma*
(which to be ſure is *Human*) I leave to the Reader t
judge, in the mean time ſhall obſerve what he faith
his *Way to the City of God*, which alſo gives Evidence
gainſt him. He begins p. 131. thus, ' Even accordi
' to that Birth he was the Son of God, no leſs than t
' Son of Man, as having God for his *Father*, as he h
' the Virgin *Mary* for his *Mother*. Is this an *Hum*
Generation then, a Generation produced of and fro
the Properties of Man in *Mary*, or a *Divine* one? Th
it is not Humane, not produced by Human Generatio
or Human Conception, he hath told us above, in t
Inſtances there given, and in *Way to City of God* p. 13
133. after having deſcribed this Birth to be ' a certa
' middle Nature, Subſtance or Being, betwixt t
' Godhead and Mankind, tranſcending even the N
' ture of Angels [he calleth it] the Heavenly or D
' vine Subſtance or Eſſence, which was both Conceiv
' in *Mary*, and is inwardly Conceived in the Saint
Are then the Properties of Man in *Mary*, and this mi
dle Nature, this Super-Angelical Nature, this Heave
ly and Divine Subſtance, relatives? Or do they ſignif
the ſame thing? That what is predicable of the one,
alſo, of the other? Or is it not rather manifeſt tha
G. K. is in Confuſion and Darkneſs, Self-contradicto
ry, and yet not Candid enough to own it, and as loth t
retract it?

He Queries, *If Chriſt's Humanity be not a Creature,*
Created, what is it? Anſw. Himſelf hath ſaid, *Way Cl*
up p. 104. (not yet retracted) ' Let all the Scripture
' be ſearched, and it ſhall not be found that Chriſt be
cam

came Man, and took to himself the Soul of Man, at his Conception in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, but only that he took Flesh, and was the Son of *Mary*, *David* and *Abraham* according to the Flesh, but according to his Heavenly Nature, even as Man, he was the Son of God—whose Name is *Wonderfull, Counseller, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father and Prince of Peace.* Thus much of his Holy Manhood, but that which was born of the Virgin, he calleth, *ibid.* p. 113, 114. 'That *Vessel* and *Temple* that Suffered at *Jerusalem*, in which Christ Jesus was and is, and in which he is now glorified in the Heavens, that he is the Root and Vine, not simply as the Word, but as the Word incarnate, and as dwelling in that most pure and wonderful Vessel that suffered at *Jerusalem*. So that here he could distinguish between the Holy Manhood that dwelt in the Vessel, and the Vessel in which it dwelt; between that which was in time, and *created*, and that which was from the Beginning.

He tells us that *T. E. hath argued in his late Book* (but where he saith not) *that if Christ be a Creature, he is not God:* Then adds, *But all who have the sound Faith, believe that Christ as Man is a Creature, or created Being, but as he is the eternal Word, he is God and not a Creature*, whereupon he suggests, *we do not own Christ hath a Two-fold Nature essential to him, the one Uncreated as God, the other Created as Man. Answ.* He slanders us, for as we own a Two-fold Nature in Christ, so we confound them not; that which was created, and that which was uncreated: For we say (as he himself said in the Citation given even now) as he is the eternal Word, he is God and not a Creature, but that God was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, and died, we read not: So that by distinguishing (as *G.K.* once did) between the Holy Temple, which is united to the Godhead, and in which the Godhead dwells bodily, and the Word which is God, and

not

not appropriated to that Veſſel what is only applicable to the Godhead, we confound them not together which the aſſerting the Creature (or what was created) to be God would do. Nor doth he explain what he means by *Chriſt as Man his being a Creature.* Doth he mean the *outward Fleſh and Blood*, which (*Way caſt up* p. 102. he ſaith) *is not the Man—but the Soul or inward Man, ſuch as Chriſt was even from the Beginning?* Or doth he mean what he calls elſewhere the *Veſſel or Temple, in which Chriſt Jeſus now is?* For the Man doth ſhift and vary his tearms ſo often, that it is hard to know whereto to hold him: Elſe methinks he ſhould not find fault with another's ſaying, *The Creature is not God.*

The next Quarrel is at *W. P.* whom he cites not fairly, although he ſaith W. P. *expreſly ſaith it in his* Serious Apology, p. 146. *W. P.*'s words are theſe, 'He 'that laid down his Life, and ſuffered his Body to be 'Crucified by the *Jews*, without the Gates of *Jeruſalem*, 'is Chriſt the only Son of the moſt High God; but 'that the outward Perſon which ſuffered was properly 'the Son of God, we deny. What *G. K.* gives is thus and as he ſaith expreſly, '*That Man or outward Perſon that ſuffered at* Jeruſalem, *is not properly the Son of God*, in which he is doubly injurious: Firſt in concealing that part, where Teſtimony was born by *W. P.* that he who ſuffered, was Chriſt the Son of the moſt High God; 2ly, In adding the word [Man] which was not there, but only [outward Perſon] which, beſides the pretending to give the words expreſly, is ſo much the worſe in him, in as much as he hath diſtinguiſhed between the Man Chriſt, and the Veſſel or Temple in which the Chriſt Jeſus now is. But theſe Tricks will do him no good, but be a means further to detect and expoſe his Fraudulent dealing.

§. 3. The

§ 3. The next passage he gives is out of *Rect. Conv.* p. 27. Before he enters upon the Explication of his own Sense now, he vents an *old* Slander against *G. W.* not oftner brought by him, than rejected and refuted as such by *T. E.* of which *G. K.* takes no notice here,) viz. that *he knew not in the least* (for how could he know what was *not knowable*, but a malitious and false Charge?) that G. Whitehead *had put the Sense upon* Heb. 9. 28. *in prejudice to Christ's coming without us, to judge the World in his glorified Person, which since he hath found*, he saith. Yet in p. 28. of these *Explications*, after having alledged (without proof) *that* G. W. *and other leading Men among the* Quakers, *have by their printed Books led them into this foul Error*, he (as if he were conscious to himself of over-charging them) adds, *although now he and some others seem to own it, that Christ will outwardly come again*, though (lest this Grant should seem too favourable, to such to whom he will not be Just) he insinuates, that if *Scrutiny were made among them one by one, few among them in comparison would be found to own it, in respect of the many that would deny it.* Thus, instead of fairly confessing his own fault in traducing us undeservedly, he heaps up False Accusations, without proof, and that are the Fruits of Prejudice and Enmity, for which will be Bitterness to him in the end, when Christ shall come to Judge him except he unfeignedly repent.

He hath not spent so much time in venting groundless Calumnies at others, but that he will make amends for it (if that will do) in being as short, when he comes to his own part. *He is convinced* (he saith p. 27.) *that the true Sense of those words*, Heb 9. 28. *is of Christ's outward Coming the second time, in his glorified Body to judge the World, but he shall not enlarge to give his Reasons at present, why he so understands it, nor to answer* LARGELY *the Reasons he gave in that Book, for that would take up too much time, and it sufficeth, that he retracts that Sense formerly*

merly given, which, he thinks, *is the more general sense Christian Expositors. Answ.* One would think that fr the third Month 1695 to the tenth Month 1696. which this came out (as I take it) had been time eno to have made his Work more compleat; if not, by consent he should have had eighteen or nineteen Mon longer to have done it in. But I guess there was som what else in the Wind, he can better find time to cut new Work, Summon us to his Court at *Turners-H* and bespatter us behind our Backs, than cope w those Reasons he offered in that Book, for I am pe suaded they are too Mighty for him, and that he wo not have given us this little, if he could possibly ha avoided it with any Credit. However I observe he *modest* all of a sudden, that he will not averr *all* Ch stian Expositors are of his Mind; nay he doth but thi it is the *more general* Sense of them, which is pre fair for a Man that runs on at his rate, and is not ov much upon the guard in his Assertions: And it is w he will allow any to be Christian Expositors, who not of his Mind. Somewhat was the matter sure, t he is no more Positive nor Uncharitable.

Yet that he may not seem to have nothing to say himself, though he will not cope with his former R sons, he alledgeth that *whereas it is said*, He will pear the second time without Sin unto Salvation, *not inferr (being understood of his Coming without us to Ju ment) that Sin remains in the deceased Saints until his C ing, but that at his Coming, he will not charge Sin them, but will solemnly acquit and discharge them of their Sins, whereas upon all others he will charge their S upon them, as is clear from* Matt. 25. *Answ.* Where Sin remains (as *G. K.* saith it doth not in the decea Saints) there is none to Charge: But where it doth main, it seems he will Charge it, for which he referrs *Matt.* 25. and the Reason is plain they were *Goats*, penit

exaltent Sinners, perſiſted in Evil to the laſt: How-ever he goes on, *Though the deceaſed Saints need no Sal-vation from Sin, yet from ſome of the Effects or Conſe-quences of it they do, until the Reſurrection*, for which he quotes *Paul*'s Saying, *We are Saved by Hope*, &c. *and that ſeing Death is the laſt Enemy that is to be deſtroyed, the Reſurrection from the Dead is that Salvation*, &c. *Anſw.* He diſtinguiſheth not between Salvation from Sin and the compleating the Glorification: The Ac-quittal, the Diſcharge, the Salvation is *preſent*; the Reward, and Fulneſs of Glory comes *after*, when Chriſt comes to Judgment: *By Hope we are Saved*, ſaith *Paul*, their Salvation was preſent, and it was a Salvation by Hope; their Hope related to the eternal Reward and Enjoyment, unſeen, for Hope that is ſeen, is not Hope. I ſhall alſo conſider what he ſaith of *Death not being fully and in all reſpects ſwallowed up in Victory, and that full Salvation and Enjoyment attained, which all true Chri-ſtians do yet wait for*, which he gives out of *Rect. Corr.* p. 42. as a Evidence *his Belief then and now was the ſame. Anſw.* That [the Promiſed did from the Beginning in-wardly come into the Hearts of thoſe that believed, bruiſed the Head of the Serpent, and deſtroyed him that had the Power of Death, the Devil] himſelf hath aſſerted *Way caſt up*, p. 99. So that the Deliverance was *preſent*, the Acquittal and Salvation *preſent*, the Perfection of Triumph, wherein Death ſhould be fully and in all Reſpects (even *Univerſally* and *Irrecoverably*) ſwallowed up in Victory, was *to come*, then the Salva-tion and Enjoyment will be full, which as he links them together, beſpeaks his then Senſe was not, that the ſolemn Acquittal was to be poſtponed to the laſt day for what ſolemn Acquittal or Diſcharge had the Sheep, *Matt.* 25. but rather a Rehearſal of what they had done for Chriſt?) but that the Compleatneſs of Glory was then to commence. Nay what himſelf writ then,

I deem

I deem a more fit Expounder of his Senſe then, than *G. K*'s preſent Allegations, which are partial and designed to ſtrain things, as that he may not ſeem to be the inconſtant Man, he is. He ſaid p. 39. of *Rect. Corr.* (ſo little before the Citation which *G. K.* gives here (*viz.* out of p. 42.) 'His inward Appearance may well 'be called, his Appearance the ſecond time without 'Sin unto Salvation, namely to effect that inward cleanſing and Sanctifying unto *Perfection*. This he there delivered as the Effect of the inward Appearance. Is it probable then, that *G. K.* could then believe the Salvation from Sin, the Acquittal, the Diſcharge was to be delayed to the Day of Judgment, when he ſaid it was to be perfected here? Or is he willing he may be ſuppoſed to have claſhed againſt himſelf formerly, that it may be the leſs Surprizing, that he doth ſo now?

§. 4. I now come to conſider how far he retracts what he once delivered concerning *Baptiſm* and the *Supper*. With reſpect to Baptiſm, he ſaith, p. 28. *Whatſoever is ſaid in his* Rect. Corr. Truth Defended, *or any other of his Books whatſoever, that Water-Baptiſm was not commanded*, Matt. 28. 19. *he fully and freely retracts*. Then he gives us what he had ſaid to the ſame Effect in his *Ant. and Sadd.* p. 34, 35. without taking notice of my anſwer thereto, in my *Keith* againſt *Keith*, p 8 to 92. wherein I ſhewed how *imperfect* that Retractation was, limited to the Expoſition of two Scriptures, *viz.* *Matt.* 28. 19. relating to Baptiſm, and *1 Cor.* 11. 26 relating to the Supper. And ſeing he hath extended his Retractation no further yet, I ſhall not only refer the Reader to thoſe I had collected in my *People called Quakers Cleared*, p. 35, *&c.* but alſo expoſe ſome more of his Contradictions upon that ſubject of Water-Baptiſm (which are not given as an Expoſition upon *Matt.* 28. 19.) for him to reconcile or retract in his next.

In his *Presb. and Ind. Chur.* p. 184. printed *Anno* 1691, he urgeth, ' If Water-Baptism had been a standing Gospel Commission, *Paul* would never have said, *He was not sent to Baptize, but to preach the Gospel, nor have thanked God he baptized so few.* It were strange to think, that *Paul* would thank God he did not so fully obey a Gosel-Precept, said *G. K.* then. Thus farr *assertory*, now let us hear him *argue* the Case. To his Adversaries alledging, that *Paul* meant Christ sent him not *principally* to baptize, *G. K.* replies, *Truths Defence* p. 134. ' Why doth he transgress his own Rule, to go ' from the proper to the improper Signification of the ' word [Note, This is *G. K*'s Rule also, *Uni. Gr.* p 43.] ' Why might not *Paul* and others Baptize without a ' Commission, to wit by a Permission, as well as he did ' Circumcise *Timothy*? To this Query I will oppose another Query of *G. K*'s, as I find it in *Truth Advanced* p. 183. Qu. 4. ' Whether *Paul*'s Saying, He thanked God he did Baptize but a few at *Corinth*, doth prove that Water-Baptism was of no more Esteem or Value than Circumcision, seing a Faithful Preacher might say concerning a People to whom the Gospel had been preached——He thanked God he was not sent to preach to them, but to a People that were more Worthy? Doth this prove that the Preaching of the Gospel is to be laid aside? saith *G. K.* And now I Query, Did *Paul*, or doth any Faithful Preacher, preach to a People they are not sent to? He knows who once objected that against the National Clergy: But not a word of that now, for fear he be brought upon his Knees for it. But *G. K.* fit to reprove another of transgressing his own Rule, who one while gives wanting a Commission as the Reason why *Paul* thanked God he baptized so few: another while suggests by way of Query, that was not, but the Hearers Unworthiness. If he will undertake to defend both, let him.

In p. 29. he saith, *It is not proper for me in this place to give any large account* (Why not? Will he do it in *another place?* or is he minded wholly to shift it?) *of the reasons why I am otherwise minded, as to the Sense of those two places of Scripture*, Matt. 28. 19. 1 Cor. 1. 26. But I think it *not improper* for me to give one of his Reasons why he was *so* minded, out of *Presb. and Ind. Chur.* p. 182, 183. who then said, 'To call that a Command 'of God, which he hath given them no Command to 'practise, is to set up the Precepts of Men in the room 'of God's Commandements, as the Pharisees did of 'old, and is a taking of his Name in vain, for which 'he will not hold them Guiltless. And they can ne'ver prove [adds he] by all their Art and Skill, that 'Water-Baptism is commanded by Christ, *Matt.* 28. '18, 19. for all God's Commands and Precepts, espe'cially of publick Institution, relating to the Church, 'are express, in so many express words, and are not 'left to be gathered by uncertain and doubtful Conse'quences. This is argumentative, and let him get over 'it, if he can, and detect the Unsoundness thereof, if he 'dare cope with it. In the mean time let us hear, whether the Reason he now offers (and which we may suppose to be his only one, and that his talking of *Reasons* is a meer Flourish) will weigh down this. He saith, *We no where find in all the Scriptures such a Phrase or manner of Speech, that ever any Man (but Christ alone who is both God and Man) did Baptize with the Holy Ghost or had Power so to do. Answ.* [That God and Christ gave the Holy Ghost, and did baptize with the Holy Ghost, by the Ministry of Faithful Men, both in Preaching, Prayer and laying on of Hands] himself hath acknowledged, *Truth Advanced*, p. 184. printed but *Anno* 1694. Therefore what he adds here (*That this distinction of the Apostles Baptizing not* Principally, *yet* Instrumentally *or* Ministerially, *is as false and unwarrantable*

to say, God created the World principally, yet Angels did it instrumentally; Christ redeemed the World principally, by his Death and Sufferings, but the Martyrs redeemed it by their Deaths, instrumentally) will ſtand him in no ſtead, except he could prove on behalf of Angels and Martyrs, that the former created the World inſtrumentally, and the other redeemed it inſtrumentally, as he hath granted that God and Chriſt have Baptized by the Miniſtry of Faithful Men. For although we read the Angels are ſaid to be *Miniſtring Spirits, ſent forth to miniſter for them who ſhall be Heirs of Salvation*, Heb. 1. 14. yet we no where read they were inſtrumental to the Creation (for God created the World not only principally, but even without Inſtruments) nor was the World ſo much as *inſtrumentally* redeemed by the Death of the Martyrs, their Death was not ſo much as contributary thereto, but *ſolely and wholly* by Chriſt the Redemer. So that the Caſes are not parallel: And if this be his topping Reaſon, he may well talk of keeping the reſt behind.

His Reaſon why the Coming of the Lord mentioned 1 Cor. 11. 26. *is this outward Coming*, he deducing *from the outward Practice of breaking of Bread in the Supper* (which I rather take to be that himſelf might *eat Bread* among them, who continue the Practice of breaking of Bread) naturally leads me to ſhew the Defectiveneſs of his Retractation, even herein. For were he a *Sincere* not *Belly-convert*, why doth he not retract and enervate what I have offered in my *People called Quakers Cleared*, p. 38 to 41. out of his *Rect. Corr.* p. 60 to 65 and *Tr. Def.* p. 9 & 139 to 142. And why not tell us what he thinks of the Supper *as now uſed*, as well as of *them who uſe it*. In his *Preſ. and Ind. Ch.* p. 185. he ſaid, 'That 'which ye now uſe is neither ſubſtantial Dinner nor 'Supper, being only a little Crumb of Bread, ſcarce ſo 'big as a Nut, and a Spoonful of Wine or two, which 'hath little outward Subſtance, and NO INWARD

'AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICATION 'unto you, as ye use it, while ye altogether deny that 'the Saints are Partakers of the Substance of Christ, or 'that Christ really and substantially dwelleth in his 'Saints, &c. Will he say so still? For he hath not yet retracted this. Or will he now say, Theirs is a Supper, and that Christ dwelleth not really and substantially (but by a *Metaphor* and *Allegory*) in his Saints? Or will he rather take a Mid-way, couching himself under general Expression, till he sees he can make no longer Friends, but of them who repute breaking of Bread to be a continuing Divine Ordinance, and of his Flock at *Turners-Hall* too? And whereas he said, *ibid.* p. 184, 185. 'These who altogether are for the out-'ward Baptism and Supper, and deny wholly the in-'ward and Spiritual Baptism and Supper of Christ, 'which is only known and received by the Holy Spirits 'inward Revelation, no Charity can be allowed unto 'them, to judge them true Christians in any degree, 'but *altogether* for the time Hypocrites and Formalists. Will he retract or defend this now? Or would not himself be willing to be one of *these* Hypocrites, *or a worse*, provided they would receive him and maintain him?

He saith now p. 30. *That it stands well with good reason, that what is represented to Mens Hearts of our Lord's Sufferings by their Hearing, Sight, Smell, Tasting and Feeling, in the use of these Signs instituted by himself, will more effectually affect their Hearts and Souls, than what is done alone by the Hearing or Reading*, &c. Whereupon I Query, of whom he thus speaketh, Of Men, or of Children? If of *Men*, I must put him in mind that he once spake of and pretended to *witness a Preaching and Hearing* beyond what could affect the outward Senses, even *a taste and discerning begotten of the Lord, which tasteth Words and Works, as the Mouth tasteth Meat*, Imm. Rev. p. 180.

p. 180. as I have also observed Sect. I. §. 3. If of *Children* (*viz.* of such of whom he said, 'If these who are 'so Zealous for Water Baptism, where cordially Zealous for the Inward and Spiritual Baptism, they might 'be the more borne with, as Men bear with Children, 'that use Likenesses and Figures of things, that suit most 'with the Age and State of Children, *&c.* See *Presb. and Ind. Chur.* p. 184.) then when they become Men, they must put away Childish things according to that of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 13. 11. So that take him *either way*, while one of them is unretracted, he runs himself upon the Pikes: Which had he been sincere and true even to his present Sentiments, he might have obviated by a hearty espousing of the one Cause, and as heartily renouncing the other: But this *Laodicean* way of neither Hot nor Cold, will be Spued out, even of Men, in time.

He alledgeth indeed (without so much as touching upon what we have offered out of his former Books) *that God hath given him of late, since he found many of the People called Quakers greatly opposed the Faith in Christ Crucified and raised again, as a necessary thing to our Christianity and Salvation* (as he falsly chargeth us) *a further and clearer sight, and a more deep inward Sense and Consideration of the great Benefit and Advantage the Practice of these outward things* (*when duly practised*) *is to the Preserving the Christian Faith and Doctrine in the World.* But in this he is not plain, whether he *now* reputes them *duly practised* or no. What he believed formerly, hath been shewed above, and his not being found in the Practice of those things he pretends God hath given him so clear a sight of the Benefit of, would tempt one to think, that (if he durst acknowledge it) his Sense is the same still, with respect to its not being duly practised, which perhaps he might declare, had he no expectation of personal Advantage from them who *use it*. for to suppose there is so much Benefit and Advan-

tage accruing by the due practice of it, that this sight is given him of God, and yet that it is no where duly used, is very preposterous: For sure that which shews the Benefit it is to the preserving the Christian Faith and Doctrine in the World, would both lead into the due Practice, and capacitate duly to practice it: But the Man is like himself in every thing, who adds, *That God hath given him to see that the Spring and Rise of that great Opposition in many against these outward Practices, hath been and is a secret Prejudice against the Doctrine of Christ Crucified, and the mysterious working of an* Antichristian *and* Diabolical *Spirit, designing to draw Men from the name and thing of* Christianity *to* Paganism *and* Deism, *and at the next step to* Idolatry *and* Atheism, as p 30, 31. *Answ.* This is a lying Divination and ungodly malitious Charge which *G. K.* hath taken up, from the Father of Lies, for which he will not be held guiltless, in the day to come, except he repent. If it were so with him (when he said of the *Means and Ordinances* used by the *Protestants*, 'Ye make it a Mediator, and so rob him '[Christ] of his Glory', and are ALL GROSS 'IDOLATERS, as the *Papists*, who make the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints their Mediators, see *Innocency Rev.* p. 87.) he should not have entituled others to it, from his own Guilt. But I believe I hit upon a truer Reason even now, *viz.* That he seeks himself in what he doth, not others.

His telling us p. 31. *The Abuse of things ought not to take away the due use of them*, is as idle. For first, Why is not he then in the *due use* of them himself? Is he afraid it will not down at *Turners-Hall*? 2ly, Why did he, as confessed by himself, Sect. I. §. 17. propose the having *Colledges become like Abbacies, for the Rudeness, Unmannerliness and other Unchristian Behaviour of many Collegians*, if the Abuse ought not to take away the due Use? Will he undertake now to say, They were not Schools

of

of good Learning? If so, let us hear him. If not, must Colledges of good Learning become an *Habitation for Owls and ravenous Beasts* (as he proposed *Innov. Rev.* p. 137.) and the reason assigned in this Book, be the *Abuse*, the irregular Lives of the Scholars, and yet will he defend the Abuse ought not to take away the due Use? Is there no Contradiction, deserving a Retractation, in all this? Or can it be supposed that the *Pious and Learned* among my Sort, will make use of such a *Protem*, for their *Sect master*, who changeth as the Wind, and pretends not to see it?

§. 5. From what follows, citing a Passage out of *Rect. Corr.* p. 71. he saith, *These foregoing words, For that Coming of Christ in his Bodily Appearance at* Jerusalem, *Antichrist will not, doth not deny, I retract as unsafely worded*, &c. *Answ.* But doth he retract them as *unsound?* For his Retractations, as they come from him very *sparingly*, so also as *faintly*, who while he is profuse in bestowing hard names upon others undeservedly, saying theirs are *Beams, gross and vile Errors, destructive to the Fundamentals of Christianity*, &c. the *few* he gives of his own are with him but *Motes, an undue Application of a Scripture or two, and that to defend a Truth, unsafely worded*, &c. Then he goes on, *Though a sort of Antichrists may not deny, but confess in Hypocrisie to Christ's outward coming; as also they may confess in Hypocrisie to his coming in Mens Hearts*, &c. (He had best look to it, he have not marked out himself for an Antichrist) *yet I am satisfied* (saith he, but offers nothing to satisfie another) *the true meaning of these words*, 1 John 2. 18. *compared with* 1 John 4. 3. *respects principally the Coming of Christ in the Flesh, as he outwardly Suffered*, &c. *Answ.* Then it doth not affect the *Papists*, at least *principally*, whereby the Man hath given away the Controversie depending betwixt the *Papists* and *Protestants* (so far as he is able to do it)

in the Deſcription of Antichriſt. For if the Apoſtle deſcribed, at leaſt principally, that Antichriſt was to ſpring from among them that denied Chriſt's outward coming, then Antichriſt *(the principal Antichriſt)* was not to riſe out of the *Papacy*, but from among *Jew*, *Turk* or *Pagan*, as the Papiſts would willingly perſuade us. Doth he think this will pleaſe any ſort of Proteſtants? Or did he do it, on ſet purpoſe, that if he ſhould be outed of *Turners-Hall*, and a Prop ſhould fail him from among the Proteſtants of ſeveral ſorts, whom he would fain gain to his ſide, to ſuppreſs our Books and diſturb our Meetings, he might have an *Aſylum* among the Papiſts? If ſo, let them take him, for I am perſwaded, all ſober Proteſtants who know him, will be Sick of him in a while.

As kind as he is to the Papiſts, he is willing we ſhould ly under his Obloquy, whom he chargeth p. 30. (upon no other proof but a referring to divers of his own Books in general, and to his *Narrative* and *Antichriſt and Sadducees* in particular, without giving any Quotation or Page, or ſo much as taking notice of our anſwers any otherwiſe than by a renewed Slander, that ours are but *ſeeming Confeſſions we give to the Man Chriſt without*, while, as he falſly alledgeth, *we place Mens whole Salvation upon an inward Principle*, &c.) *as denying Chriſt come in the Fleſh in three reſpects*, for after he hath branched the Denial of Chriſt come in the Fleſh into four Particulars, as, 1. *to deny, with the* Jews, *that he who did ſo come, is the Chriſt.* 2ly, *To deny that he is both God and Man, to be worſhipped with Divine Adoration, as the* Mahumetans *do, and that the Man Chriſt is our Salvation, and the Object of Faith and Adoration.* 3ly, *To deny the Vertue and Efficacy of his being a Sacrifice, by his Death, for the Remiſſion of all Mens Sins, who ever ſhall be Saved from the beginning to the end of the World.* 4ly. *To deny that all the Light, Grace and Divine Influence of his Spirit that any Man hath,*

hath, or ever had, is by Jesus Christ, who hath procured and purchased it by his most holy and perfect Obedience unto death, he assigns the three last, to our Charge upon his single Evidence, which as a notorious Falshood and Slander we reject. Yet in as much as he here pretends he will *call me to an account e're very long*, for my *Keith* against *Keith*, who should have delayed his Charge, till he produced his Proof, I shall tell him, I may chance to call him to an *account* hereafter, if he do not make out his Charge, when he emits his Answer to mine.

§. 6. Upon his having said, *Kell. Corr.* p. 195. ('Nor doth it follow, that because Confession in the Adult is necessary, that therefore Baptism with Water is') he thus paraphraseth, viz. *I still adhere to it with all charitable Christians, that Baptism with Water is not of equal Necessity with Faith and Confession, unto Salvation. Answ.* But herein he *foully prevaricates*, concealing his sentiments formerly, relating to Water-baptism, and by the words [still adhere] representing them, not as a Retractation (but rather as a Confirmation) thereof. Or will he now say, as he did then p. 195. that 'to affirm Water-Baptism is necessary to Salvation is nothing but a Popish Superstition, which the Protestants generally deny, *&c.* and offer to prove (as he did then p 191 to 195.) that Water-Baptism was not commanded by Christ, *Matt.* 28. and that *Paul's* Commission, though he was not sent to Baptize with Water, was as universal and full as that of the other Apostles? If so, let us hear him? If not, Why doth he pretend *still* to adhere to it, that Water-Baptism is not of equal necessity with Faith and Confession, unto Salvation, and assign the reason here, *That many of the Martyrs did only confess to Christ, who were put to death before they could be Baptized, and that the desire of Baptism, in such cases, is judged equivalent to Baptism?* Is that it he adhered

hered to then? If not, where is the Man's Honesty? Where his Integrity? Instead of a fair Retractation, to labour to render his Sense then and his Sense now (so widely discrepant) as if *they both* had needed rather Confirmation, than *either of them* a Retractation? But such shifts become his Cause.

His next Essay is to prove the Necessity to Salvation of Confession in the Adult, which is managed as unsuccessfully. For though he did say, in the Citation given, 'Confession of the Truth may well consist without 'Water-baptism, namely in a holy Conversation, and 'Profession of Christianity with the Mouth, as the Apostle said, *With the Mouth Confession is made to Salvation*. Yet this doth not prove what he would inferr p. 33. from this Book which he saith *was Printed for* 16 *Years past*, viz. that *it is no New Doctrine for him to say, It is a Necessary Duty, that every one among the* Quakers *should give a Confession of their Faith to Christ and his Doctrine in the Fundamental and Essential Parts thereof, before they can be owned to be Members of a Christian Communion, and that* [illegible] *they do this, whatever great and high pretences they make, &c. they can never be justly esteemed a Church of Christ.* For that Confession may well consist in a Holy Conversation and Profession of Christianity with the Mouth, is *one* thing, and the Confession with the Mouth is not only Necessary to Salvation, but we must have Creeds or Articles of Faith composed for us to Subscribe or Answer by Yea or Nay (that which he proposed, when he began to grow quarrelsome in *Pennsylvania*) is *another*. Yet in as much as he hath pretended to have been 33 Years amongst us, and a Preacher the most part of the time, I ask him, How came we to hear nothing of this from him, till he began his Schism in *America*? Nay why did not himself give us his Confession of Faith in order to his own Induction at least into the Ministry? Or was he never fit to be

own[illegible]

ned as a Member of a Christian Communion, till of e, that he began to set up for himself, in Opposition his *quondam* Brethren? Or will he maintain that himself and the Christians of that Age were thus ated themselves? If so, I demand Chapter and erse; if not, what doth he think of them, were *Paul* d they fit to be owned Members of a Christian Comnion, or to be justly esteemed a Church of Christ? nd from this *Dilemma* let him fairly acquit himself, if can. Whereto I shall add, That a Confession, even ith the Mouth, we both Approve of and Practise, t not in Man's time, by Human Prescription, or acording to the Will of Man, nor in the *words which Man's Wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth*, Cor. 2. 13. For Confession as well as Prayer cannot e performed, *as we ought*, without the help of the Spi-, 1 Cor. 12. 3. *Rom.* 8. 26.

§. 7. That which comes next, instead of a Retraation, is a Defence of his *Truths Defence*. He had ere ascribed p. 101. that *Revelation was Immediate*, nd Argued upon it p. 105. that 'to speak properly all Revelation is Immediate, even as all Vision is Immediate.' This he toucheth not upon here, though e gives us a Citation out of the same Pages, to prove hat he then admitted 'the Word Immediate Revelation is not any Scripture Phrase, and that if the thing it self were granted, that God doth inwardly reveal and speak his Mind, *&c.* as he did in and to his Saints of Old — so that the Saints do hear, see, perceive, taste, savour and feel after God himself, as he reveals himself in his Son by his Spirit, the Controversie about the Name or Phrase would soon be at an end.' Which we readily grant him, for if Men witnessed the *Thing*, they would not contend against the *Name* or Phrase, but rather allow it, nor should

we

we so much press the Term, but in order to enfor
and evince the Thing. Therefore his Comment up
it, *That 16 Years ago he was not for holding up a Contr*
versie about the Name or Term, Immediate Revelation,
no way deduceable from the Premises, for besides th
he did not then say he was for holding up no Contr
versie about the Name &c. but that the granting t
Thing would soon put an end to the Controversie abo
it; so his own Practice, in those Pages, which was
Arguing for and Defending the Term, declareth,
then took it to be a necessary Medium, in order
gain a Belief of the Thing, to insist upon, explain a
defend the Tearm. What he adds (without shew
proof) *against many of us, that we have earnestly a*
fiercely contended for that term, and his insinuating wi
a [*no doubt*] *will much blame him for not contending fo*
it now, deserves my notice no further, than a rejectin
it, as a Slander, of which he hath store. For we n
other ways contend for the Tearm, than himself did
that very time, *viz.* as a suitable means to perswade
the Thing, and prefer the belief and witnessing the in
ward Revelation (which would take away all Dispute
about the Phrase) to any Contest about the Name.

Upon a Presumption that we blame him now for no
contending for the Tearm, he Queries, *Are they be-*
come of late more Eagle-sighted to see this and other things
they judge to be Errors in my Book, which they did not for-
merly see, or at least gave me no notice of? Then why do they
blame me, that I have both of late seen, and noticed diver
Errors in their Books, which formerly I had not seen, fo
want of due Examination, nor noticed? Answ. He state
the Case amiss with respect to us. What we have Col-
lected out of him being not so much to detect the *un-*
soundness of his Principles, as his late *Contradictions* to
his former Principles, and is rather a Vindication o
them, for the most part, than the contrary. Yet i

upon

upon this view, which he hath led, he hath drawn and it were invited us to, by pretending (as in his *Serious Appeal* p. 21.) that *he hath not Contradicted himself in* ANY THING, referring to his *own words in his Printed Books* for proof, we have not only shewed he hath Contradicted himself in MANY THINGS, but have also found, here and there, especially in those Books bordering upon the time of his Schism from us, an unsound passage or two, are we to be blamed for our exposing of them, which perhaps had not occurred to us, but upon the Scrutiny himself occasioned? Whereas himself had Read our Books, and in Year 1692. quoted them in Print in his *Christian Faith* and *Serious Appeal*) an Evidence of our Soundness in Doctrine, who a little time after quoted some of the very same Books to prove us unsound in those very Doctrines (as I have shifted already in my *Apostate Exposed*, and *Keith against Keith* p. 57, and 116.) which shews *G. K.* is not so much *Eagle-sighted*, as *Double-sighted*, looking *variously* yea *contrarily* upon one and the same Object, as himself is changed from a *Friend* to an *Enemy*.

§. 8 *G. K.* after having given a Citation out of *Truths Def.* 170, 171. ' That if nothing should be required of one sort from another as an Article of Faith, but what is expressly delivered in Scriptures, in plain express Scripture Tearms, of how much Advantage it might be to bring to a true Reconcilement &c. *Faith* p. 33, 34. *some of his late Opponents have brought this place to prove him guilty of a Contradiction, by his late practice of what they call, his imposing on them unscriptural Creeds and Tearms, as when he told them, They must believe in Christ without them for Salvation* &c. *Answ.* His stating his Opponents Allegations, even if he had not so often Notoriously traduced them, deserves no Credit, except he had brought his Proofs along with him, by *whom, where*

and

and *when* they were so laid down. Yet whether *G.* may not have *so* Preached Christ without, Heaven Resurrection and Day of Judgment without, in such terms as might minister just occasion to some to endeavour to hold him to his own Rule, of Scripture terms and expressions, may deserve our Enquiry. I shall then that *C. Pusey* in his *Modest Account* p. 56, to after having given the Citation out of *Truths Defence* much larger than *G. K.* hath here given it, Queries thus *ad hominem*, 1. 'Where are the express words of Scripture that say, The same Body for Matter and Substance shall rise—— 2. That none but those that have the Faith of Christ Crucified can love Enemies— 3. That the 400 Pieces of Silver that *Abraham* Purchased the Burying-place with, signifie 400 Vertues and that those who have not those 400 Vertues cannot have the Priviledge to be Buried in that most Excellent Burying-place— 4. That *Adam* and *Eve* were not Naked before the Fall, and that the Garden God placed Man in, was no part of this visible Earth— 5. That Men may not have that Holy Ghost, that was given to Believers in Christ Crucified, without the Faith of Christ Crucified (whereas *G. K.* had said in *Looking-glass for Protestants*, p. 28. It is our Faith that the Heathen once had the Spirit of God, and that *Pharaoh*, before his Heart was hardned, had the Spirit of Grace)— 6. That the Light is not sufficient without something else— 7. That no Man can attain unto Eternal Life and Happiness without the Knowledge of Christ's outward Sufferings, Death, Resurrection &c. If this was it *G. K.* meant by his Charge above, it reacheth not his purpose, for (waiving that I might say, would I take *G. K.* for my Example, C. P. *doth but Query, they were simply proposed to him as Queries*, as *G. K.* hath alledged for himself *Ant. and Sadd.* p. 34.) what he doth Query is not

Whether

Whether we (viz. we, to whom the History hath been revealed) must believe in Christ without us for Salvation (the terms of *G. K.* his Charge) but whether NO MAN can attain to Eternal Life and Salvation without the Knowledge of Christ's outward Sufferings &c. which being an Article of *G. K.* his Faith at present, even contrary to what he had Asserted formerly, who then was for keeping to express Scripture words, *C. P.* hampers him with it, and is cogent against *G. K.* but not to the End assigned by *G. K.* for that we must believe in Christ for Salvation, is not questioned, but whether no Man can attain to Eternal Life and Salvation, to whom the History is not revealed, is the Query. Thus much for *C. P.* now let me present the Reader with the *gross* Notions I brought out of his Book of *Truth Advanced*, relating to the Resurrection. He had said p. 27. 'That the Coats of Skins wherewith God clothed *Adam* and *Eve* after the Fall, was a clothing them inwardly with the Righteousness of the Lamb— and outwardly with the Skin and Flesh of this Frail, Mortal and Corruptible Body— that the true Body of Man lyeth within the Shell, Oar or Mine of this Gross, Heavy and Corruptible Body, and that is it which shall be the Resurrection-body, at the Resurrection of the Dead. (And upon this Notion *that Man had not this Grosness and Imperfection before the Fall*, he grounds his *Chimera*, p. 28. of *Man and Woman being made Back to Back before the Fall, and afterwards split or divided into two halves, in order to their multiplying their Species, which they could not do without that Separation, as they might have done, if the Fall had not been*). And in p. 113 he saith, 'Within this Brutal Skin of the gross Body that rotteth in the Grave, there is lodged the true Body of Man— that at the Resurrection of the Dead nothing of the drossy part, that is Brutal, shall Arise, but only that which is proper to Man as Man,

'such

' such as *Adam* had before the Fall. So the Flesh th
' is Gross, Mortal and Corruptible, is not that Fle
' that shall be Raised up Immortal and Incorruptibl
&c. And p. 115. he tells us, ' The Separation
' made between the pure and noble part and that dros
' part in Man's Body in the Mystical and Invisib
' *Machpelah*, or Sepulchre in *Hebron*, in the Land
' *Israel*, Figuratively and Mystically understood, th
' *Ephron* signifieth the *Dust-Eater* and the 400 Peices
' Silver, so many Vertues, the number 400 [as
adds p. 116.] ' being produced of Four answering
' the Four Elemental Principles and Qualities of th
' Body, and the number Ten to the Ten Comman
' ments, which may be branched forth into other Te
And a little lower, p. 116. that ' the Graves that sh
' be opened at the Resurrection are not any visib
' places on the Globe of this Earth, but certain invis
' ble places to our Carnal Eyes, where they are lodge
' until the time of the Resurrection. [And p. 117.
' Thus commonly Men have two Graves, the first give
' them by Men till the Separation be made betwixt th
' Kernel and the drossy part by Putrefaction (as sup
' pose after a Year, more or less) the second give
' them by God *&c.* Now he having in the close of thes
thus summed up the Matter, p. 118. *viz.* ' But again
' the Doctrine of the Resurrection, as HERE del
' vered and opened by plain Evidence of Holy Scrip
' ture, and in Scripture-words and tearms, to whic
' it is only safe to keep in this and all other things *&c.*
I (in my *Keith* against *Keith* p. 46, 47, and 141.) pu
him upon giving plain Evidence of Scripture, and i
Scripture-words and tearms for these his Monstrou
Notions of the Resurrection. Whereby the Reade
may perceive, I give better Light into the Controver
sie, as well as assign Page and Passage, than *G. K.* had
done, who now dare leave it with the Judicious, who

the

ther *G. K.* hath not administred occasion to be reflected on, as transgressing his own Rule.

He saith p. 34. *The word* without *is easily understood, when we speak of Earth, Sun, Moon, Stars,* Judea, Moses, David, *that they were without us, and that Christ was Born at* Bethlehem, *and* Bethlehem *was without us,* and adds at the close, *it had been as little needful to have mentioned Christ without us, as Heaven without us, as* Judea *without us, had not that wild Notion of many, who own no Christ without, nor Heaven, Resurrection, nor Day of Judgment without, occasioned it. Answ.* This is to Slander not prove, nay he doth not so much as attempt to prove it, wherefore as a false Charge I reject it. To the rest I say, whatever Exposition agreeable to the Scriptures, may be allowed to another, *G. K.* having precluded himself by that Passage Cited, *Truths Defence* p. 170, 171. ought not to Claim it: For his saying, 'Nothing should be required from one sort to another, as an Article of Faith, *&c.* but what is expressly delivered in Scripture, in plain EXPRESS Scripture-tearms, signifieth either *something* or *nothing*. If *nothing*, what was it said for? If *something*, where's the *boundary*? We see how largely he hath ranged in what hath been given above, by *C. P.* and my self? Who while pretending to be of the same Mind still as formerly, now interpreteth his meaning to be, *not that every word must be expressed in so many Letters and Syllables, when there is no necessary occasion for it, but in plain easie terms, as are equivalent to Scripture terms.* But who shall be judge of the occasion, say I, or that the tearms are equivalent? For this brings all into *uncertainty* again, if *G. K.* may be his own judge: It is as much as to say, They must be delivered in plain Scripture-tearms (which are obvious to every one that can read) or in equivalent terms (of which my self, not the Reader shall be judge.) And upon this stock, as he hath already grafted his *Hydra* of Absurdities and

Contradictions, enough to nauseate the Sober and Intelligent, so may he superfœtuate upon them at pleasure, who had he kept to Scripture-words and expressions perhaps had found never a Stone to fling at Friends in *America*.

§. 9. The substance of what he gives out of *Truth's Defence* p. 191, 192. is 'that the Sacrifice of Christ's 'Death did truly extend for the Remission of Sins past 'from the beginning of the World, that all the Believers that lived under the Law and Prophets, and before the Law, were saved by Faith in Christ—— and 'by Vertue of his Death and Offerings, once for all, all 'have had, have, or shall have a Day of Visitation—— 'and shall be accountable to the Man Christ, on the 'score of his Dying for them. Upon this he descants p. 35. not retracting but defending it, as proving *that he did not place our* WHOLE *Salvation upon an inward Principle, excluding the Man Christ Jesus from being jointly concerned with his Light, Grace and Spirit in Men, as* (he falsly saith) *many called* Quakers *do: And that he then held, that all who were saved in any Age of the World, were saved by Faith in Christ, as well before he came in the Flesh as since.* All which is granted him, as I have often told him, but whether that Faith was ALWAYS attended with a Revelation that he came and suffered outwardly, else NOT SAVING, is the Matter in Controversie. For whereas some had objected, *There can be no Justification without Faith in Christ, but these Gentiles had not Faith in Christ, G. K.* answers *by denying the second Proposition, Uni. Gr.* p. 30. that they had not Faith in Christ. And how did he prove that, may some say? Did he offer to prove that they had an Implicit Faith in Christ (his late distinction) or that they might have the History of what Christ did and suffered, or was to do and suffer, without Circumstances

of

of Times, Places or Persons (a new-coined fetch he hath in Sect. I. §. 18. of these) nothing less. But as I had said *Imm. Rev.* p. 243. that 'true Religion and Christianity may subsist without the History of Christ in the Letter, to wit in the Mystery of the Life of Christ in the Spirit; and yet, even here, where the History is wanting, the Mystery or Inside of Christianity is not without its Skin or Outside, namely an outward Confession to God *&c.* So here *Uni. Gr.* p. 30. he saith, 'If they did cleave unto and believe in the Light, they believed in Christ, for he is the Light, nor is the outward Name that which saveth, but the inward Nature Vertue and Power signified thereby, which was made manifest in them *&c.* So that Faith in the *inward Manifestation* was Faith in *Christ* then with *G. K.* and also Saving. This he calls *ibid*, p. 34. 'the main and principal Thing, the Word of Faith, the *Gentiles* did share in with the *Jews*, that whoever among the *Gentiles* did believe and call upon the Name of the Lord, were saved, no less than the *Jews*. And *ibid* p. 56. he calls it, 'Some Manifestation of him, in and among the *Gentiles*, *sufficient to Salvation*: As well as that he had said, *ibid* p. 36. 'The very Gospel hath 'been preached to ALL, otherwise they should never 'have been charged with not having obeyed it. All which I offer that *G. K.* may not couch himself under general tearms, and thereby cast a Mist before his Reader's Eyes, as he endeavours to do in what follows, where he saith

That by Faith in Christ, I meant the Man Christ (who is both God and Man) who in the fulness of time came in the Flesh, and shed his Blood, for the Remission of their Sins, is obvious to any Intelligent Reader. Answ. Then it seems he was the Man Christ *before* that fulness of time, that he came in the Flesh and suffered, *viz.* that which he calleth *Way to City of God*, p. 133. 'That Heavenly and

'Divine Substance or Essence of which the Divine
'Birth was both Conceived in *Mary*, and is inwardly
'Conceived in the Saints *&c.* As such he calls him the
'Seed of the Woman that even at Man's Fall was given
'to bruise the Serpents Head, and to be a Lamb or Sa-
'crifice to attone and pacifie the Wrath of God to-
'wards Men, and that he bore the weight of his out-
'ward Sufferings, in great measure, from the very be-
'ginning. See *ibid* p. 125, 126. Now the Matter in Debate between *G. K.* and us, even with respect to what he hath formerly asserted, is whether this Attonement, this Sacrifice, this bearing the weight of his Sufferings from the beginning, did bruise the Head of the Serpent in none, attone for none, save none, either before Christ's Offering up of himself in the outward, or where a Revelation from God, that he should so suffer, was not given? That without his outward Coming, according to the Decree of God, Redemption had never been Purchased, so that whoever are saved in any Age of the World, it is by Vertue thereof, is fully and heartily acknowledged by us: But whether this Vertue hath never saved any, but where the History (I do not say, the Circumstances of Times, Places *&c.* but the History) hath been revealed, is that wherein we oppose *G. K.* formerly to *G. K.* latterly. Therefore what he adds, *That we are most injurious to him, and false Accusers of him, who call this a new Doctrine, to affirm that all whoever were saved with Eternal Salvation, were saved by Faith in the Man Christ, either express or implicit, even by him that was in the fulness of time Crucified for them*, is an unfair stating of the Controversie. For besides that contrary to his own Rule (*Ex. Narr.* p. 24. as hath been hinted more than once) the terms [Eternal, Express or Implicit] are added to the Premises, to make a noise with, that he may seem to say somewhat to salve up his own Contradictions, which he accounts *false Logick* in another;

ther; Faith in the Man Christ is not the Matter in Debate, but whether Faith in the Man Christ implies always a Belief of what the Man Christ was to do and suffer in time: For the Man Christ he asserts (*Way cast up*, 123.) *is present in and among us*, and adds, *I do not mean his external or outward Person, for that is ascended into Heaven*: Whereas he would now confound the Man Christ and outward Person together, as if the believing the Man Christ, as inwardly manifest, and what the Man Christ did and suffered outwardly were equivalent terms. But he hath many a passage to Retract, if he now would render these terms convertible, and suggest that what is predicable of one, is also of the other.

This brings me to what he accounts a *Trifling and Nonsensical Objection in us* (but where it is objected, he doth not) *to argue that they could not believe in Christ Crucified, before he was Crucified, for that it was one and the same Christ that was to be Crucified and that was Crucified, even the same yesterday, to day and for ever. Answ.* We grant it, that he who *was to be* and *who was* Crucified, is the same yesterday, to day and for ever, who though he received something additional in time, *viz.* the Flesh, which he had not from the beginning, yet was no less Christ, before he descended into the Womb of the Virgin, than since. Yet to open the occasion of this Objection of mine, which this *Trifler* calleth Trifling and Nonsensical in us, the distinction I shall shew is *G. K*'s, not ours, by assigning it, *Truth Advanced*, 70. 'as a dangerous and hurtful Error to say, that Men may have that Holy Ghost that was given to Believers in Christ Crucified, without all Knowledge and Faith of Christ Crucified [which to refute, he adds] 'It is not said *Cornelius* had the Holy Ghost in his *Gentile* state— nor is it any where to be found that any received that Holy Ghost, which Christ promised PARTICULARLY to Believers in him, but such only

' who believed in him, even Christ Crucified and Rai
' ed again, &c. And also p. 71. ' It is called the Hol
' Spirit or Spirit of Holiness because it worketh a pecu
' liar degree and kind of Holiness in all true Believe
' in Christ Crucified, above what the most upright *Ge*
' *tiles* do witness or experience in their meer *Genti*
' state. Now this *Error* he pretends to *correct* in other
is *not* that Men may have *that* Holy Ghost (as his tearm
are) and not believe in Christ (for who held so?
pray) *but* that they may have it, and not so believe
as to have his Crucifixion revealed to them. For he w
not pretend sure, that *Cornelius* believed not in t
Light, believed not in Christ, when his Prayers a
Alms came up as a Memorial before God, though
did not account him a Believer in Christ Crucified. A
why? Not that Christ within and Christ without a
two Christs? But because that Heavenly Mystery w
not yet made known to him. So that the distinction b
ing his, the *Trifling* is his own, and the *Nonsensicalne*
if any Bodies, is *G. K's*, who is the Raiser, the Auth
of it.

This leads me to take notice what he offers ne
with respect to the *Gentiles* not having that Holy Gho
which the Believers in Christ Crucified had. I havi
in my *People called Quakers cleared* p. 20, to 33. pinch
him with Contradictory Passages thereto out of his fo
mer Books (more I have added since, *Keith* again
Keith p. 9, to 39.) *G. K.* in his *Ant. and Sadd.* p. 2
varies the tearms thus, *viz.* ' He is not said to be t
' Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit in wicked Men, nor in p
' ous *Gentiles*— to wit, by Union. Whom tha
might drive out of this muse, I Cited him (*Keith*
gainst *Keith* p. 60.) out of his *Divine Imm. Rev.* p.
saying, ' *Plato*, *Plotin* and other *Gentile* Philosophe
spake of a most inward Union and Communion of
Soul with God in a certain Intellectual and Spiritu

cont

contact or touch, &c. Now to help himself off here, when he had touched upon my Objection (without so much as naming me, or any Book that he had it out of, but only in general that *his Adversaries had objected it*, as if he designed the Reader should not find it) he Answers p. 35, 36. *That* Plato *had no Faith in Christ, so much as implicit, is more than they can prove, and that divers Sayings in his Books makes it probable he had. As to* Plotin, *who lived above* 200 *Years after Christ, and wrote against the* Christians, *he suggests his Expressions might not be so much from his own Experience, as his Master* Plato's *Writings, or allowing he might have some true Experience of a Divine Contact or Union, it was in some transient way, like a glance or flash of Lightning. Answ.* If *G. K.* will allow *Plato* to have had the Divine Spiritual Contact, Union, &c. himself must prove beyond *probabilities*, and *may-be's*, that *Plato* had Faith in Christ, yea even in Christ Crucified and Raised again, to wit such a degree of Faith, as was accompanied with a Divine Union, such an Union which in the Quotation given out of *Ant. and Sadd.* above, he denies to have been given to the Pious *Gentiles* or to *Cornelius*, who had not that Faith. And if that could be done, and *Plato* could be proved to be more than a Speculative Philosopher, is it not pretty fair that *G. K.* even when denying that *Cornelius* (of whom the Holy Scripture give so large a Character, as *a Devout Man, one that feared God, whose Prayer and Alms were come up as a Memorial before God*, *Acts* 10. 24.) had the Holy Ghost in his *Gentile* state, should admit *Plato* might have it, and that by Union? Was *Plato* a better Man than *Cornelius*? Or is not *G. K.* worse than either? A very Changeling in Religion? And yet stiff in defending he is not so, Nay *Plotinus* himself, a Writer against *Christians* shall have so much of *G. K's* good word (though *Cornelius* go without it) as that he will not deny he had not this Union, at least

in a transient way. A sign that they who write against *Christians* (a Work himself hath lately taken in hand) have more of his Favour than the Pious *Gentiles*.

But he hath not spun his Thread fine enough yet, so that if the word [Union] will not fetch him off, but he be hampered there, in p. 36. he will *reverse*, with the words [permanent and lasting, inward residence, abiding] and then he vaunts, saying, *It is great Ignorance in his late Opposers, not to understand how the Spirit of God, who is holy, may work in the Hearts of the* Gentiles, *and Unbelievers* (but we were speaking, not of *Gentiles* and Unbelievers indefinitely, but of *Cornelius* and the *Pious* Gentiles) *yet hath no inward residence or abiding Union or Communion with them, but such only who have Faith in Christ.* *Answ.* The words fore-cited, *viz.* MOST INWARD UNION AND COMMUNION cut the Nerves of this New Exposition; for what can be so, if not that which is a *permanent, lasting, abiding Residence*; and that in the *Pious Gentiles*? But, to mislead his Reader, as he *adds*, so also he *subtracts*, at pleasure, yet gives it as our Inference. For besides the word *Pious* (which he left out, as if the Debate had been only of the *Unbelieving Gentiles*) he here speaks of Faith in Christ, not of Faith in Christ Crucified, his own termes, when he denied *Cornelius* to have had that Holy Ghost (as if there had been two Holy Ghosts) which was a peculiar Gift, to Believers in Christ Crucified and Raised again, and not to every Believer in Christ indefinitely, to whom the History thereof had not been revealed. All which shews the Man is a *meer Shuffler*, seeking to reconcile his former with his latter Sentiments (instead of retracting either) by *indirect means*, adding to and taking from the Premises, at pleasure, and yet giving them as if they were, even so stated, what we had alledged to him. A Work ill becoming a Scholar, to such Illiterate Antagonists, as he

would render us? But his Cause and Management are a-kin.

§. 10. Waving then any *Doctrinal Discussing* of the Point (for the Matter before me is a Consideration of the Incongruity and Incoherence of his Contradictory Assertions, and the Defectiveness of his false Covers) instead of shewing wherein the Scriptures alledged by him, do not answer his purpose, I come to consider the next *trifling Objection* (as he also calls it) *we have made*, but where he saith not. I had in my *Reply* against *Keith*, p. 107, 108. quoting him out of *Presb. and Ind. Chur.* p. 111, 112. shewed this Notion there (that Men who had not the express Knowledge and Faith of Christ Crucified, WHEN LIVING, might have it at or after Death, to wit, in their passing through the Valley of shadow of Death) favoured that of *Purgatory* (as in my *People called Quakers Cleared*, &c. p. 31 to 330 and elsewhere I proved what he held with respect to that of the *Transmigration* of Souls.) Now to obviate both these, he alledgeth a passage out of his *Pretended Antidote*, p. 115, 116. (which Book I know not how to come by) *That all that go to Christ in Heaven after Death, must have an express Knowledge of Christ in Heaven.* Whence he Queries, both whether the *Souls now in Heaven, can be without all Knowledge of Christ, and whether the Souls of* Plato, *and* Socrates (*whom fart be it from him*, he saith, *to suppose they are not in Heaven*) *are still without all express Knowledge of Christ? Answ.* If the Faith the Gentiles have, will carry them to Christ in Heaven, they are well enough. We doubt not but their Knowledge *there* will be compleat; nor do we think when they are once there, they will be sent back again for want of an express Knowledge, before they came thither. However I thought, before this great Philosopher arose, that the Faith and Knowledge that carried me to Christ

in

in Heaven, was *Saving* Knowledge, and that if I had not my Saving Faith and Knowledge here, I should never come thither. Thus to extricate himself from an Imputation of holding the Notion of a Purgatory, on which he was like to be ſtranded, he alledgeth another as unſound, *i. e. They ſhall have their expreſs Knowledge of Chriſt in Heaven*, the tendency of which, as it is a Procraſtination, a putting off the day of Salvation, ſo it contradicts the Scriptures, which ſay, TO DAY, *if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts*, Heb. 3. 7, 8. NOW *is the day of Salvation*, 2 Cor 6. 2. Thus he ſhews his *unſoundneſs*, in what follows his *Malice*, by inſinuating, *if ſome of his Oppoſers* (whom he names not) *think there is no Chriſt in Heaven, having any bodily Exiſtence, it's no wonder they think the Saints in Heaven have no knowledge of him.* In which he is both Injurious and Detractive, as well as Self-inconſiſtent in his malitious Charge, once vented by his Brother Apoſtate, *Chr. Lodowick*, who then defended that it was not true, and quoted a Book of *G. W.*'s called *Malice of Ind. Agent*, p. 17. and another written by ſome Friends called *Teſtimony for the Man Chriſt Jeſus*, which p. 4. cited *W. P.* on that behalf, wherein both *G. W. W. P.* and thoſe Friends aſſert the Man Chriſt's Exiſtence in his glorified Body in Heaven, ſee *G. K.* his *Chriſt. Faith*, p. 12, & 13. as he is alſo in ſuggeſting, we think the Saints have no knowledge of Chriſt in Heaven, which I remember not to have heard from him before, and is equally falſe with the former. Thus we ſee what he wants in *Evidence* he makes up in *Slander*, and all to patch up his own poor Cauſe, which the more he tacks on, of ſuch kind of falſe Allegations, the worſe it looks.

§. 11. Thus he pretends to have performed what he promiſed with reſpect to thoſe Books of *Inim. Rev. Rect.*

Brief. Corr. and *Truths Defence*, which how effectually I have already obſerved, what is wholly pretermitted may adviſe at the cloſe. The next Book he nibbles at, is *Help in Time of Need*, printed *Anno* 1665, of which he ſaith p. 37. *All theſe paſſages, ſo far as I did underſtand them, to reſpect the People called* Quakers, *as a viſible Body of People, together with the* GENERALITY *of their Miniſtry, and* GENERAL *way of Worſhip and Diſcipline*, &c. *I retract, as being too large and ample a Commendation of them* GENERALLY *conſidered—And I freely and willingly acknowledge my weakneſs and ſhort-ſightedneſs in having ſo high and great an Eſteem of them* GENERALLY *conſidered. Anſw.* Then it may yet be true with reſpect to *ſome* among the Quakers, but not to the *Generality*. Let us hear then what he ſaid then of them in *general*, and ſee whether he will now allow it to be true of *ſome* of them, in order whereto I ſhall give ſome of his own words, he hath in this Page cited, with my Obſervations from his general Retractation, in Crotchets. He then ſaid, 'Now the Light hath ſhined forth in ſuch clearneſs, 'that we [*i. e.* as now interpreted, *ſome* of us] have 'ſeen to the bottom of all *Babylon*'s Treaſures. And 'we [to wit, ſome of the People called Quakers] do 'witneſs this day come and broke up among us in pure 'perfect Brightneſs, every one in their meaſure, *&c.* 'And we [*viz.* Not the Generality, but ſome of us] 'have ſeen the Bride, the Lamb's Wife, the *New Je-'ruſalem* deſcending from above, from God out of 'Heaven—And her Light is like unto a Stone moſt 'precious, like a Jaſper clear as Chryſtal, and we '[ſome of us] have ſeen the Frame and Proportion of 'this City, with the Walls and Gates of it, (within 'which our [*i. e.* ſome of our] feet have ſtood)—And 'the Lord hath made us [ſome of us] Citizens of this 'City, and Stones of this Building—And as the Mi-

'niſtry

'nistry and Worship of the Church or House of God 'among us, [viz. among some of us] is Spiritual, so 'is the Order, Discipline and Government among us '[i. e. some of us]. And now what I have declared un-'to you (and the Manifestation of the Spirit of Truth 'will shew much more, even the perfect Pattern of the 'House of God in the Mount) concerning these things, 'which are necessary and expedient in order to a 'through, cleanly and perfect Reformation, we '[i. e. some of us] the People of the Lord, called 'Quakers have fallen upon them, being taught and di-'rected by the Wisdom of God. Thus far out of *G. K.* in which what I have inserted in Crotchets, shews the natural Tendency of this present Retractation. If this displease such among the Church of *England-men* and Protestant Dissenters he now would fawn upon, as too large a Character of any of us, perhaps for their sakes, in his next, he may retract it yet further. That he did not do it now, I do not so much impute to any remaining Esteem of any of us, as that the Man is loth to be thought wavering in his Judgment, and that therefore it would go easiest off, to make it general, which he may hereafter restrict as narrow as he pleaseth. Yet let me add, The Quakers (neither in the General nor in the Particular) do not any more need his Testimony for them, who is gone from that which gave it, than *Paul* did that of the *Pythones* Damsel, who said, *These Men are the Servants of the most high God*, &c. *Acts* 16. v. 16, 17. What I touched upon transiently in my *Quakers Cleared*, &c. p. 42. opposing this Book to that of *Truth Advanced*, being designed only as an Indication of the Instability of the Man, who would pretend not to see it, not that we craved his good word.

However to palliate his having said formerly, *The Church was come out of the Wilderness*, he alledgeth, *The chief Leaders among the People called Quakers led him into it.*

Answ.

Answ. I presume it was not long since he thought himself a *Chief Leader* among them, more fit to lead than to be lead. But why then did he entitule his Book, *Help in the Time of Need, from the God of Help*, and not rather, *Help from the Leading Quakers?* Again in p. 55. when he entituled that part, *The long-looked for Day of God, broke up among us, the Lord's People called Quakers--Writ in the Fear and Will of the Lord*, he should rather have said, *Written, Parrot-like, as I was taught.* And when he said p. 62. *The Ministry is Spiritual, and so are the Ministers, Men taught of God*, he should have added, *As I have been told.* But who led him to say, *he witnessed this day come and broke up among us in perfect Brightness*, as p. 58? Did they lead him thus to vaunt of his own Condition, beyond what was read? O Shameless, confused *Proteus!*

He alledgeth indeed at the top of p. 38. *His Zeal and Fervour did carry him too far, that he had great inward Experience of the Lord's Love and Goodness at that time* (more I doubt not, than he hath now) *that he is sensible and truly convinced he had too far exceeded in the Thoughts of his Spiritual Attainments, both then and since* (This *since*, I question not, to be too true, whatever he did *then*) *and that he freely retracts and revokes, whatever passages are to be found, in this or any of his latter Books, that are justly Offensive, on the account of his going beyond the due Bounds of his real Growth, and Spiritual and inward Station in the Truth, so far as any thing of the least mixture of Mistake or Untruth is to be found therein.* And p. 39. *That he adheres to his Testimony in this, and all other his Books, as to Matter and Substance of many weighty things therein, and the good Advice he gave to his Countrymen in that Book*, &c. All which are general Tearms, if designed for *Deceit to lurk under*, who while pretending to retract *every thing* wherein he exceeded, or where a Mixture of Mistake and Untruth is to be found,

found, and assigning no passage in particular, retracts *nothing* in effect, but gives himself Scope to extend or restrict it, as he pleaseth, hereafter, which is no Evidence of a sincere and hearty Sorrow. And what he adheres to, he leaves us as much in the Dark concerning, as if he chose rather to walk in Disguise than to be open and plain. Again, How shall it appear he had a certain Guidance in any thing, when even what he is willing we should allow him to have retracted, he hath been as positive in, and laid as high, as what he would yet be thought to adhere to? Who, if he still account that Advice *good*, he then gave to his Country-men, must still think, *That Prelacy is a Limb of Antichrist, that his Country-men ought to have kept their Vow against it*, as in p. 37 & 39. of which I shall give more in §. 13. which if he still dare defend (as he hath commended his Advice then given) to be good Counsel *still*, those of the Church of *England* may consider what kind of Proselyte he is like to prove, if they should take him in, and if the Counsel were not good, Why did he not rather revoke, recall and retract that Advice given in that Book, than applaud it as good? But the Man seems willing to keep in with both, if he can, not knowing perhaps, whom he may need a Prop from most.

§. 12. In his next he gives a Citation out of *Help*, &c. p. 63. where he had said, 'Now we need not say, Who will go down into the Grave, and bring up Christ to us, or who will ascend to Heaven, to bring him down to us, or who will go over the Seas, and bring us Tidings of him from *Jerusalem*, him (whose Name is the Word of God) we of a Truth witness near us, even in our Hearts, so that we need not either ascend, descend, or go forth, *&c.* Upon this he tells us what *T. E.* hath brought against him, out of

Book called *Truth Defended*, p. 110, 111. (for this is the only time he hath cited any Book and Page, of all that he hath alledged againſt us) which I wave taking notice of, for two Reaſons. Firſt, For that *G. K.* is ſtill Debtor to that Book of *T. E.*'s, and the *Anſwer* to *G. K.* his *Narrative*, and I deſign not ſo farr to gratifie him in picking out a ſingle Paſſage in a Book, while he overlooks the reſt, to which long ſince he made ſhew as if he would emit an Anſwer. 2ly. As my deſign is not Controverſial, but the detecting the Man's inſincere Explications and Retractations of his former Books, ſo the doing that here; and expoſing *G. K.*'s falſe Gloſs, will of it ſelf, make void what is alledged by him out of *T. E.* relating to this Quotation. The *importance* then *and ſignification of his words* above, he thus gives p. 40. *We need not ſay who will go over the Seas, and bring us Tidings of him from* Jeruſalem, *where he ſuffered in the Fleſh, for all ſincere Chriſtians are well ſatisfied with the Faith they have already of Chriſt, by the Inward Teſtimony*, &c. *So that they neither ſeek nor need any other ground of Confirmation to their Faith, either of an Outward Voice from Heaven, or from beyond the Sea, from* Jeruſalem, *&c.* Anſw. *Ground of Confirmation to their Faith*, were not the Tearms mentioned in that Book, therefore would he have kept to his own *Logical* Rule, would not have been added here. Again, as he calls a little below, 'The word of Faith which *Paul* preached, and *Moſes* before him,---which was able to Save them that turned their Minds thereto, *&c.* in *Imm. Rev.* p. 77. he had ſaid, 'He reveals the whole Council of his Will by the word of his Mouth, the Light reveals the whole Will of God---he need not go forth to ſeek a Law without him, or a Teacher without him, the Word is near---to which *Moſes* pointed the *Jews*, and *Paul* the *Romans*. Now if *they both* ſpake of one word, and *both* ſaid, Men need

not

not aſcend, deſcend or go beyond the Sea, to fetch it and *G. K.* hath cited them *both*, as concurring in the one and the ſame Teſtimony, then *G. K.* his Allegation, whereby he would reſtrict it to Chriſtians already ſatisfied, who needed no Voice from Heaven or *Jeruſalem*, as a Confirmation of their Faith, falls to the Grond in courſe; ſeing it was good Doctrine *before*, ſeaſonable Doctrine *before*, and the Cauſe alledged holds *now*, even by *G. K.* his own Confeſſion, *viz.* That the Light reveals the whole Will of God, and was able to Save them (even in *Moſes*'s day) who gave to be taught and led thereby. Had he indeed urged that the word nigh in *Moſes* his day, and the word nigh in *Paul*'s day was not the ſame, and that there was need of aſcending, deſcending and going beyond the Sea in *Moſes*'s time, which then ceaſed, when Chriſt was offered up, how Unſcriptural ſoever this had been, yet there had been ſome colour for his preſent Expoſition, whereas it being the ſame now as then and attainable not by aſcending, deſcending, &c. but an inward witneſſing it, then as now, the limiting it to ſatisfied Chriſtians, who ſeek not a ground of Confirmation of their Faith, is both an Abuſe of the Text and a falſe Gloſs upon *G. K.* his Sentiments formerly which it had been more to his Credit to have retracted than thus to have ſophiſticated.

§. 13. Herewith *G. K.* winds up his Citations out of his former Books. As for his other Books, called *Way to City of God*, *Way caſt up*, and *Light of Truth* *anſwer to* R. Gordon, *or any others of the like Nature and Importance* (which is a pretty wide Reference, ſaith he alledgeth he *ſeeth no preſent need to vindicate* *from our Perverſions and Wreſtings* (as he calleth them) *and that one not called a Quaker, but of another Commu-* (whom he names not, perhaps that he might not

over the Author of *the Snake in the Graſs*) *ſaid to him, that inſtead of doing him a Unkindneſs, they had done him a great Kindneſs.* Again p. 42. *That in diverſe printed Treatiſes of his* (whereof he names none but a printed Letter at the end of *G. Crots his general Hiſtory of the Quakers*, and his *Anti. and Sadd.* without aſſigning Page or Paſſage) *he hath given divers Explications of moſt* (he doth not ſay of *all*, but of *moſt*) *of the Quotations brought by us againſt him.* The which I take to be ſo idle, ſhifting and looſe a way of Writing, denoting Guilt and Inſincerity, that barely to repeat it, is to anſwer it, which when he ſhall think fit to deſcend into Particulars, a particular Reply may perhaps be given to.

The next thing I obſerve is that he thus beſpeaks his *friendly* and *judicious Reader*, *If any of my above-given Explications ſeem to him in any degree ſtrained beyond what the genuin Senſe of the words will bear* (though I know not any one ſuch) *I am freely willing, that what he thinks in any degree ſtrained, he may take it, if not for a genuin and proper Explication* (*if ſo be it is in the leaſt inconſiſtent with the Truth of the Holy Scripture*) *to be my plain and free Retractation: For what I cannot fairly defend by Explication, I am freely willing to correct and amend by Retractation*, p. 42. *Anſw.* This is Nonſence all over. Can the Reader at the ſame time deem it ſtrained, not genuin and proper Explication, and yet allow it to be a plain and free Retractation? For if it be an *Explication*, then not a *Retractation*, for they are not Synonimous Tearms, and if ſtrained, not genuin nor proper, then not plain and free, much leſs fairly defended by Explication. Beſides that, he that will ſtrain an Explication beyond what it will bear, cannot be ſuppoſed to be freely willing to retract it, ſeing it was his Unwillingneſs to do that, which drew him to ſtrain his Explication: So that this profound Scholar hath run

run himſelf a-ground miſerably. Yet ſurely, had he not been *conſcious* to himſelf of uſing ſtrained Explications, he need not have given this Caution to his *friendly* and *judicious* Reader, for *ſuch* are not apt to take things at the worſt hand, nor *ſo* to conceive without *juſt* Cauſe adminiſtred. Had he given it as a Caution to the *Captious* and *Inimical*, not to the *Friendly* and *Judicious*, there had been leſs ground to ſuſpect, he knew he had deſerved ſuch a Cenſure: And indeed he hath ſo managed his Work all along (as will be obvious upon the reading of theſe) that he could not expect, but it would be excepted againſt, even by the Friendly, that do not give away their Judgment.

To mend the matter he now tells us, he *freely retracts all Paſſages in any of his Books, in ſo far as they are inconſiſtent with the Holy Scriptures, and ſubmits them to the Teſt thereof.* *Anſw.* As this is general, no particular paſſage aſſigned, it is no Retractation at all: For who, even of them that are *leaſt* conſcious to themſelves of having offered what is not perfectly conſiſtent with Scripture, may not ſay ſo, and that they ſubmit theirs to the Teſt thereof, which may be rather called a *Purgation* and *Vindication* than a *Retractation?* Again, when at one time he ſaith the Text ſaith thus in the Greek, the proper and uſual Signification muſt be kept to, as *Uni. Gr.* p. 43. another while retracts that, alledgeth the Senſe would be marred, if that Tranſlation were admitted, and all this upon the ſame Scripture, as hath been inſtanced above, Sect. §. 16. and Sect. II. §. 7. what muſt be the Teſt then? Who the Interpreter? If *G. K.* himſelf? It may be a queſtion how long he will keep of that Mind? If another? Who is that other? And what Aſſurance will *G. K.* give that he will ſtand to his Arbitrement? Yet upon this he gives his Reader very oily Words, tells him how *ready he would be to correct them*, for the

poſſi-

possibly divers other particulars may have not been observed, and p. 43. That *he would receive an Information most kindly, as a most friendly Office, and judge himself greatly obliged to be thankful to him*, which I take as an *artificial* Cover, that he might not be suspected to have slipt over *so many* without the least notice, which he had received Information of. As for ours, he represents them to be without a *right Understanding, from a Spirit of Prejudice, or a Scoffing, Taunting, Airy, Unchristian Spirit*, which as it is no Encouragement to any Man to take the Pains to be Scavinger to his Books (for what Security can the Reader have, he shall be better treated?) so it denotes, not a hearty Desire of Information (for why then did he over-look them he was informed of?) but a design to hide and cover himself under specious Pretences, and excuse himself from engaging, where he cares neither to retract nor defend. Who saith of *T. E. C. P.* and me, That *we have blamed and censured the soundest Passages for most part in his Books, in relation to Doctrine, though generally such as most need Correction, we have past without the least Censure.* To which I answer, In as much as he is thus conscious to himself of passages that need Correction, why did he not clear his hands of what was depending, before he called upon his Reader for *more* Work? To the rest I say, It is Contradictions, not Doctrines that we have mostly alledged out of his Books: And where they have offered themselves, we have taken them; the censuring his Doctrines, any otherwise than by comparing the Contradictory Assertions, being the *least* part of what we have been engaged in.

He begins p. 44. thus, *Finally, with a free and willing Mind I make a general Retractation of all the hard Names, and uncharitable Censures, I have at any time past upon any, differing from me in point of Judgement—that have not deserved them.* But who have deserved them, and

what Cenſures ſuch have deſerved, he that knows, can tell: For *G. K*'s part, the Determination he keeps in his own Breaſt. Wherefore I appeal to the ſeveral ſorts of Proteſtants in this Nation, Doth this ſatisfie you, whom he thus hath cenſured and given theſe hard Names unto? Do ye look upon this as a ſincere, hearty Retractation, ſpringing from *deep Regret*, as he gives out, or that it is any thing but a *meer Shift*? Is this *ſufficient* Compenſation to you, the Members of the Church of *England*, for his tearming 'Prelacy a 'Limb of Antichriſt, *Help in Time of Need*, p. 37. 'That filthy thing ſet up in the Land, p. 38. telling the *Presbyterians*, 'They did well in departing from 'you, who gave your ſelves forth to be the Lord's 'Miniſters and Servants, running and he ſent you not, 'and that your Covetouſneſs and Ambition, and ſeek-'ing how to pleaſe Men, and not any Zeal for God, 'ſet you on lording it over the People, and that what 'ye gave forth as his Ordinances, *&c.* were the meer 'Inventions of Men, and *Babylon*'s golden Cup of For-'nication---for whoſe Pride, Pomp, Covetouſneſs, 'Tyranny and Ambition, God's Wrath was kindled 'againſt you, and he poured Contempt and Deſola-'tion upon you, *ibid.* p. 47, 48. Or to you of the *Presbyterian* way, for his alledging in the Title Page, 'That ye have GENERALLY ſhrunk from what 'but of late ye ſo zealouſly aſſerted and maintained 'to be the Cauſe and Work of God [Was not that, your Covenant againſt Prelacy? ſay I] 'the MOST 'PART actively complying to the building up again 'and healing old *Babylon*---like the Dog returning to 'the Vomit, and the Sow to the Puddle, after the be-'ing once waſhed) others lying by, and cowardly 'bowing under, and giving up themſelves to a *deteſta-'ble* Neutrality. And p. 50. 'That when ye got upon 'the Walls and Bulworks of your Enemies building,

'and

'and levelled it to the Ground, when ye had rooted 'out *Prelacy*, and the *many Corruptions and Superſtitions 'that accompanied the ſame*, and digged down a good 'part of *Babylon*'s up-ſetting, that then ye took your 'ſelves to build---Whoſe Form of Church-Diſcipline, 'Order and Government, is nothing upon the Matter 'better than the Epiſcopal, ſaith *G. K.* p. 52. Or to you *Independents* and *Baptiſts* for linking you with the former, as 'ALL of you open and declared Enemies 'to the Holy Spirit, its inward Revelation and Inſpi-'ration, *&c.* ſee *Preſb. and Ind. Ch.* p. 45. For theſe are not yet retracted by him, and how know ye but he ſtill eſteems you, as DESERVING theſe Epithets? It is true indeed, he pretends a little below, *He was never ſo uncharitable as to judge that few or none were truly Pious, or of a true Chriſtian Spirit, but ſuch as were of the ſame Profeſſion with him.* So that he was *charitable* it ſeems, when he gave this Character of you in the Lump: And I do not find he clears you *yet*, except by ſuch a particular Exception out of a general Rule, which leaves you in the dark as to the Exemption, to the Indemnification, not to the Charge. Whoſe Senſe of you now, if we may gather from his Judgment upon others, in his *Way caſt up*, p. 35, 36. where acknowledging that the Lord had ſome among the Presbyterians, who belonged to his true Church, he ſaith, 'Far the greateſt Number of their Church-Members were of Groſs and Scandalous Lives, utterly Inconſiſtent with true Piety, is not a very charitable one. And are the reſt of you ſure, he thinks better of you?

What he widely (and without ſhew of proof) alledgeth againſt us, *as oppugning the great Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Religion, and of naſty tearms and words uſed by ſome Preachers among us, worſe than* Bill inſgate, which he alſo aſſigns in *general* Tearms without ſpecifying what they were, and who gave them, while he applauds himſelf,

himself, as *never having that Faculty*, deserves not my notice, except to reject as an unproved Slander. The Man is gauled and fretted, his Work being too heavy for him, either to clear himself, or make out his Charge against others, whom if he cannot overturn with Arguments, he would fain over-run with Noise. But *no Weapon that is formed against thee, shall prosper, and every Tongue that shall rise against thee in Judgment, thou shalt condemn*, said the Lord of his *Heritage* of old, *Isa.* 54 17. who is the same to his, to day, yesterday and for ever.

§. 14. Thus having gone through *G. K.* his *Explications and Retractations*, the Fruit of 18 Months Toil, and shewed what poor, silly, shifting, deceitful and evasive Allegations he hath used all along, more like a *Pedantick Trifler and Quibbler* (his Charge upon others) than a Man of *sound Knowledge and Expression* (his own Character of himself) and also reflected upon his insincere and mincing Retractation, of those *few* he pretends to Correct, as if in *nothing* Doctrinal he had erred, but only in an undue application of a Scripture or two, not *unsound* but *unsafely* worded, and that many times delivered in *ambiguous* tearms, I had once thought to have Collected those Passages he hath wholly pretermitted, and we have exposed in ours, to which these are pretended as an Answer. But considering this would add too much to the Bulk of these, which hath already swelled beyond my desire, and that it will necessarily fall in, in course, if ever he reply to ours, Five where of lye upon his Hands unanswered, I forbear at present waiting to see whether the next 18 Months will produce a more mature Birth, than the preceeding have done. Yet not so, but that I shall direct where they may be found, and what Subjects they Treat of.

I shall then premise, that had he really designed to purge himself, satisfie his Reader and reclaim what he could

could not defend, or wherein his Judgment was altered, he would have been ſo far from overlooking whole Books (as he hath done, his *Light of Truth*, *Way Caſt up*, *Way to City of God*, *Presb. and Ind. Churches*, *Chriſtian Faith* and *Serious Appeal*, to which I may add his *Poſtſcript to* G. W's *Nature of Chriſtianity*) that he would rather have erred on the other hand, by *repeating them over and over*, as he inſinuates, in his *Preface*, that we have done. Nor would he have excuſed himſelf by a ſilly pretence (depending upon his own Veracity, without Demonſtration) that ours needed them not, that we had perverted and wreſted his words, *&c.* as hath been obſerved already. And had he been really and conſciencioufly concerned (or to uſe his own words, p. 44.) Did he, *with deep Regret, acknowledge and blame his too great raſhneſs, in giving hard Names and paſſing uncharitable Cenſures, on ſuch as deſerved it not*, he would have deſcended to a more particular Retractation, and Explanation what the *undeſerved* Names and Cenſures were, and who deſerved them not; whereas now, this limitation and reſerve opens a way to him to make a *Noſe of Wax* of his Recantation at pleaſure, as they pleaſe him, or his future Circumſtances put him in a condition, either to ſtand in need of them, or the contrary. And whereas (over-paſſing his more early Books) he had Vindicated us ſo lately as in the Year 1692. even ſince he began to be litigious in *America*, as ſound with reſpect to *moſt* of if not *all* the Doctrines he now pretends we are unſound in, and that *from 28 Years converſe, both in publick Meetings and private Diſcourſes, even with the moſt noted and eſteemed among us*, as he alledged, *Serious Appeal*, p. 7. and that this hath been objected to him (both in my *Apoſtate Expoſed*, a Book *G. K.* is ſtill Debtor to, and elſewhere) it is not ſufficient for him now to heap up unproved Accuſations againſt us, without taking notice of what we have ſaid in

our

our Defence, but to have offered (had he designed a thorow Retractation, even thereof) ſomethiug at leaſt, as an Evidence that his Opinion then was ill grounded, and now leans upon a ſurer and faſter bottom, than that of Prejudice or a Perſonal Pique, which every Judicious Reader knows, is apt to miſs-way the Judgment. Thus far in general: Now to be more particular, I come to recapitulate ſome of the Quotations, *G. K.* hath wholly leapt over, wherein what I give out of him in *one* Book, I ſhall not offer again, when brought by us in *another*, as not deſigning more ſhew than ſubſtance.

The firſt I ſhall obſerve, is what *T. E.* hath offered in his *Truth Defended* p. 47, to 50. out of *G. K.* his *Imm. Rev.* p. 179, 188, 190. relating to a knowing a Tree by its Fruits, proceeding from an inward reliſh, taſte and diſcerning; which *G. K.* hath not touched upon to Explain or Correct.

The next, Treating concerning the Man Chriſt, as being Man from the beginning, before outwardly Born and Conceived of the Virgin, that as inwardly revealed he was a Lamb or Sacrifice to attone and pacifie God's Wrath to Man, the promiſed Seed, the Seed of the Woman that did actually bruiſe the Serpent's Head ever ſince the Fall, had inward Fleſh, which the Holy Men fed on, in ALL AGES, and that more than viſible Fleſh is the Ranſom, out of *G. K.* his *Imm. Rev.* p. 226. *Way caſt up*, p. 93, to 99, and p. 102, 103, 104, 111, 141, 142. *Way to City of God*, p. 125, and *Rect. Corr.* p. 20, 21, 27, 28. may be ſeen in *T. E.* *Truth Defended*, p. 117, 119, 91, 94, 104, 142, 150, and in his *Anſw. to Narr.* p. 36, 46, 86, 87, 100. oppoſed there to *G. K.* his late Sentiments. For what he gives but even a tranſient touch at the Page, how little ſoever he ſay to the purpoſe, *thoſe* I bring not but *theſe* he hath entirely overlookt.

Wha

What *G. K.* had aſſerted of Chriſt's Bodily Preſence, not being ſufficient to the Church, that Chriſt is Mediator as he is in Men, *T. E.* hath given in his *Anſw. to Narr.* p. 87, 88, 108. out of *G. K.* his *Imm. Rev.* p. 59, 120, 121, 107. and *Way to City of God*, p. 127, 139. none of which *G. K.* takes any notice of.

Of Chriſt's Reſurrection-Body, that it is not Carnal, but Spiritual, *T. E.* giveth in his *Truth Defended*, p. 127. and *Anſw. to Narr.* p. 47, 55. out of *G. K.* his *Rect. Corr.* p. 23, 24, 44, 54, 55. alſo overlookt by *G. K.*

I ſhall be very Cautious in what I bring out of my *Quakers Cleared*, in as much as *G. K.* hath pretended to Anſwer it, in his *Ant. and Sadd.* deſigning only to give ſuch Quotations, as he hath ſlipt over both there and here, although *G. K.* his Entituling theſe, as what may at preſent ſuffice to the Anſwering *T. E.* and my former and latter Books, I might have been excuſeable, had I took him at his word (which he ſo ſeldom keeps to) and brought them nevertheleſs. Therefore leaving him to ſupply that defect, when his E'RE VERY LONG comes, that he emits a larger Anſwer to mine, and alſo over-paſſing what I have already hinted §. 4. of this Section, touching *Baptiſm and the Supper*, that his Retractation of what he had ſaid in his *Truths Defence* and *Rect. Corr.* related only to his Expoſition of two Scriptures, *viz.* *Mat.* 28. 19. and 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. and out of my Sect. I. §. 18. wherein I gave what he had omitted out of *Imm. Rev.* p. 228, 232, and 242. I ſhall only offer, that what I gave out of *Uni. Gr.* p. 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 56, 57, 58, 115. (concerning an inward ſaving Illumination, given to the *Gentiles*, the Goſpel its having been Preached to all, and that the Word of Faith within was the main and principal thing, in Oppoſition to his Sentiments of late) he hath *twice* ſlipt over, both in his *Ant. and Sadd.* of which I

save notice in my *Keith against Keith*, p. 71. and also here, in these.

What I have alledged to him in my *Keith against Keith*, p. 9, to 36. (as inconsistent with what he had delivered in his *Chr. Faith*, p. 6, 7. *Truth and Innocency Defended*, p. 19, 20. *Further Discovery*, p. 17, 18. and *Truth Advanced*, p. 70, 71.) out of *G. K.* his *Light of Truth*, p. 11, 15. *Postscript to Nature of Christianity* p. 65, 70. *Universal Grace*, p. 8, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 36, 52, 53, 54. *Looking-glass*, p. 28. *Imm. Rev.* p. 77, 103, 105, 109, 111, 112, 113, 213, 221, 227. *Way cast up*, p. 44, 45, 95, 99, 100, 103. *Rect. Corr.* p. 50, 150, 187. *Truths Defence*, p. 70, 114, 121, 141, 212. *Divine Imm. Rev.* p. 26, 27, 63, 54, 55, 79, 154, 158. *Plain Short Catechism*, p. 9. These *G. K.* toucheth not upon, in the least.

To which I shall add what one *W. C.* (*a Church-man*) hath gleaned out of him, in Two Small Tracts, the which, whoever presented them before him, he will not pretend, I suppose, not to have seen. The first was Entituled, *Mr.* G. Keith *at* Turners-Hall *Contradicting Mr.* G. Keith *at the* Tolbooth *of* Aberdeen, wherein there opposeth to several Passages in *G. K's Ex. Narr.* Quotations out of his *Imm. Rev.* p. 200, 243, 244, 231, 4. chiefly respecting the Object of Faith, a *Fundamental* Principle, as in p. 5, to 10. of that Book. In his Second Letter, stiled, *Mr.* Keith *no* Presbyterian *nor* Quaker, *&c.* from p. 7, to 15. he gives *G. K.* his Contradictory Sense relating to Baptism, the Supper, Sinless Perfection, Election and Reprobation, and Common and Saving Illumination, and that out of *G. K.* his *Quakerism Confirmed* (as to be found in the Collection of *R. Barclay's* Books) p. 586, 618, 619. and *Uni. Grace*, p. 105. I wave what was there also brought, not only out of the Pages (fore-quoted) by *T. E.* or me, but even those out of *Uni. Gr.* p. 74, 75, 76. because the

tho' those Passages are not touched upon by *G. K.* yet something having been brought by him out of those Pages, although with different Ends and upon a different Occasion, I will rather not insist on it, than administer a seeming room for Exception.

Without making any further Comment upon these Omissions of *G. K.* having shewed what we expect from him, I shall only observe, that notwithstanding he could not but be Conscious to himself of his manifold Pretermissions, and evasive Shiftings of what he hath touched upon, in the close he presumeth to say, *he prays to God, we may have a Heart given us of God, if not to follow him as an Example, yet to follow the Example of other* GREAT PENITENTS— *for he that hideth his Sin, will not prosper*, &c. Which (besides the taking the Name of the Lord in vain) shews *great Hypocrisie and great Searedness*, as well as *Ostentation*, in ranking himself among other *great* Penitents, forgetting, it seems, or at least little regarding the Wise Man's Counsel, viz. *Let another Man praise thee, and not thine own Mouth; a Stranger, and not thine own Lips*, Prov. 27. 2. Whether the *friendly* and *judicious Reader*, he would lately bespeak on his side, will not think this *strained*, and undeserving the Applause he *craves*, is left to his mature, sedate and impartial Consideration.

Beel-house, 23d of the First Month 169$\frac{6}{7}$.

J. P.

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

PAGE 3. Line 14. and l. 32. p. 8. l. 26. p. 8. l. 24. p. 12. l. 9. for *Retrati* read *Retractation.* p. 4. l. 20. f. *seeing* r. *waving.* p. 8. l. last r. *with* p. 9. l. 22. r. *Doctrines.* l. 28. r. *a profitable.* p. 10. l. 15. r. *thing.* l. 29. r. *commended.* p. 12. l. 19. f. *perusing* r. *perverting.* p. 13. l. 14. r. *given* P. 15. l. 33. r. *Endowment.* p. 19. l. 20. r. *Capernaumites.* l. last and p. 20. l. r. *Capernaumitish.* l. 30. f. *and* r. *or.* p. 23. l. 30. f. *It. and.* p. 24. l. 8. af *Christ* r. *as he came in the Flesh.* l. 11. r. *Spirit.* l. 28. after *Flesh* r. *face to fa* p. 25. l. 2. after *not* r. *say.* l. 20. f. *that* r. *the.* p. 28. l. 20. r. *Christ's.* p. 3 l. 20. r *word.* p. 31. l. 10. r. *judicially.* p. 32. l. 6. r. *of our.* p. 33. l. 7. f. r. *after.* p. 34. l. 8. f. *Seed* r. *Heir.* l. 14. f. *Divine* r. *more Noble.* p. 35. l. after *and* r. *so.* l. 28. f. *absolutely* r. *so lately.* p. 36. l. 27. f. *yet* r. *not.* p. 3 l. 16. f. *and* r. *or.* p. 38. l. 7. r. *become.* p. 39. l. 1. f. *the* r. *his.* p. 40. l. 2 f. *of* r. *into.* l. 31. f. *within* r. *with him.* l. 31. r. *light within.* p. 41. l. 15. *the* r. *this.* p. 42. l. 3. f. *how* r. *how.* l. 20. f. *left* r. *loft.* l. 32. r. *consequential* p. 44. l. 18. f. *the* r. *that.* l. 20. r. 1 *Cor.* 15. 12. p. 46. l. 25. f. *or* r. *and.* p. l. 25. f. *be* r. *become.* l. 28. after *pretended* r. *to.* l. 32. f. *withdrew* r. *what dre* p. 50. l. 17. f. *are* r. *serve.* p. 52. l. 19. f. 69 r. 62. p. 55. l. 26. f. 14 r. 1 p. 59. l. 21. f. *of* r. *in.* p. 60. l. 8. r. *calling.* l. 33. r. *all Men.* l. 34. r. *ex part* p. 63. l. 8. f. *them* r. *all.* l. 16. r. *a vail.* p. 65. l. 8. f. *Wrath* r. *Truth.* l. 1 f. *they* r. *he.* p. 69. l. 2. r. *respect to.* p. 73. l. 13. r. *tell.* p. 81. l. 20. l. 69 p. 92. l. 1 r. *appropriating.* p. 93. l. 8. f. *the* r. *that,* l. 24. dele *for,* p. 99. l. f. *this* r. *his,* p. 102. l. 1. r. *advantage,* p. 107. l. 5. r. *initiated,* l. 20. f. *ascribe* r. *asserted.*